arXiv:1106.6063v1 [math.LO] 29 Jun 2011

APPROXIMATING IMPREDICATIVITY IN REVERSE MATHEMATICS

HENRY TOWSNER

ABSTRACT. In reverse mathematics, is is possible to have a curious situation where we know that an implication does not reverse, but appear to have no information on on how to weaken the assumption while preserving the conclusion. A main cause of this phenomenon is the proof of a Π^1_2 sentence from the theory $\mathbf{\Pi^1_1\text{-}CA_0}$. Using methods based on the functional interpretation, we introduce a family of weakenings of $\mathbf{\Pi^1_1\text{-}CA_0}$ and use them to give new upper bounds for the Nash-Williams Theorem of wqo theory and Menger's Theorem for countable graphs.

1. INTRODUCTION

The strongest of the "big five" systems of Reverse Mathematics is the system $\mathbf{\Pi^1_1\text{-}CA_0}$, whose defining axiom, Π^1_1 comprehension, states that

$$\exists X \forall n [n \in X \leftrightarrow \forall Y \phi(n, Y)]$$

where ϕ is an arithmetic formula (that is, a formula without set quantifiers). This axiom is *impredicative*: the set X is defined in terms of a quantifier over all sets, particularly including the set X itself and sets which may be defined in terms of X.

It is impossible for a Π^1_2 sentence to imply $\mathbf{\Pi^1_1\text{-}CA_0}$ (see [8, Corollary 1.10] for a proof); this means that any proof of a Π^1_2 sentence in $\mathbf{\Pi^1_1\text{-}CA_0}$ can be optimized to go through in some weaker system. Despite this, $\mathbf{\Pi^1_1\text{-}CA_0}$ is the best known upper bound for several Π^1_2 theorems (in particular, the Nash-Williams Theorem* of bqo theory [8] and Menger's Theorem for countable graphs[12]; rather than give the definitions necessary to state these theorems here, they are discussed in detail below).

In this paper, we attempt to resolve this situation in a systematic way: using ideas derived from the functional interpretation, we isolate the portion of $\mathbf{\Pi^1_1\text{-}CA_0}$ actually being used in these proofs, giving a family of weaker systems with Π^1_2 axioms, and then show that the proofs in $\mathbf{\Pi^1_1\text{-}CA_0}$ actually go through, essentially unchanged, in these weaker systems.

Rather than being based on the Π^1_1 comprehension axiom, we base our systems on the equivalent leftmost path principle:

> Let T be an ill-founded tree of sequences. Then there is a leftmost path through T.

Our family of weaker systems use the Σ_α-relative leftmost path principle:

> Let T be an ill-founded tree of sequences. Then there is a path Λ through T such that no path through T which is Σ_α in $T \oplus \Lambda$ is to the left of Λ.

Partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1001528.

*Actually, the Nash-Williams Theorem is not Π^1_2, but rather can be deduced in $\mathbf{ATR_0}$ from a Π^1_2 sentence.

We define $\mathbf{\Sigma_\alpha}$-$\mathbf{LPP_0}$ to be $\mathbf{RCA_0}$ extended by the Σ_α-relative leftmost path principle, and $\mathbf{TLPP_0}$ to be $\mathbf{RCA_0}$ extended by Σ_α-relative leftmost path principle for every well-ordering α. Note that these formulations are still fundamentally impredicative: the branch Λ promised to exist is still to the left of paths which might be defined in terms of Λ itself.

Our main results can be summarized as:

Theorem 1.1. (1) $\mathbf{\Sigma_0}$-$\mathbf{LPP_0}$ *implies* $\mathbf{ATR_0}$ *(Theorem 4.2).*
(2) $\mathbf{\Sigma_2}$-$\mathbf{LPP_0}$ *proves Kruskal's Theorem (Theorem 5.5.*
(3) $\mathbf{A\Pi^1_1}$-$\mathbf{TI_0}$ *(see* [14, Chapter VII.2]*) implies* $\mathbf{\Sigma_{<\omega}}$-$\mathbf{LPP_0}$ *(Theorem 6.22).*
(4) $\mathbf{TLPP_0}$ *proves the Nash-Williams Theorem (Corollary 7.12).*
(5) $\mathbf{TLPP_0}$ *proves Menger's Theorem for countable graphs (Theorem 7.19).*
(6) $\mathbf{\Sigma_{\alpha+2}}$-$\mathbf{LPP_0}$ *proves the existence of an* ω*-model satisfying* $\mathbf{\Sigma_\alpha(\Pi^1_1)}$-$\mathbf{TI_0}$ *(Theorem 4.3),*
(7) *In a model satisfying* $\mathbf{\Sigma_{\alpha+1}(\Pi^1_1)}$-$\mathbf{TI_0}$ *and* $WO(\alpha)$ *with* α *a successor,* $\mathbf{\Sigma_\alpha}$-$\mathbf{LPP_0}$ *holds (Theorem 8.12).*

We emphasize that this paper does not give novel proofs of any of the mathematical theorems analyzed; our proof of Kruskal's Theorem is unchanged from Nash-Williams' proof [9], our proof of the Nash-Williams Theorem is taken from Marcone's work [8], and our proof of Menger's Theorem is the one given by Shafer [12]. Our goal is to illustrate that the methods here isolate the portion of $\mathbf{\Pi^1_1}$-$\mathbf{CA_0}$ already being used in existing proofs, without requiring changes to the proofs themselves.

We briefly explain the motivation for the relative leftmost path principle. The leftmost path principle is a Π^1_3 sentence. Consider the analagous situation at the arithmetic level, a Π^0_3 sentence:

$$\sigma = \forall x \exists y \forall z \phi(x, y, z).$$

If we prove a Π^0_2 sentence τ using σ, we do not expect to need the full strength of σ in the proof. The functional interpretation (see [2, 7]) can be used to extract a function F from the proof of $\sigma \rightarrow \tau$ together with a proof of

$$[\forall x \exists y' \forall z \leq F(x, y') \phi(x, y', z)] \rightarrow \tau.$$

Informally, a proof of $\sigma \rightarrow \tau$ in a reasonable system cannot actually use the fact that the witness $y(x)$ to σ is a genuine witness for all z; the proof only used the fact that $y(x)$ is a witness for finitely many particular choices of z (where the particular choices may depend on the value of $y(x)$), and therefore it suffices to use an "approximate witness" y' which good enough for this particular proof.

The relative leftmost path principle follows a similar justification. A proof of a Π^1_2 sentence from the leftmost path principle cannot depend on having an actual leftmost path; instead, given a supposed leftmost path Λ, the proof must produce some (now countable instead of merely finite) list of paths (again, depending on Λ), and use the fact that none of these paths are actually to the left of Λ. An appropriate form of the relative leftmost path principle then gives us an "approximate witness" which is good enough for a particular proof. (This analogy between set and numeric quantifiers is a bit misleading if taken too seriously; the arguments given in this paper are actually derived from a functional interpretation for quantifiers over ordinals [3].)

2. NOTATION

We briefly recall some notation which will be convenient to use throughout this paper.

We fix, throughout this paper, a computable bijective pairing function $(\cdot,\cdot) : \mathbb{N}^2 \to \mathbb{N}$. We routinely view subsets S of $\mathbb{N}$ as subsets of $\mathbb{N}^2$ by equating S with the set of pairs x, y such that $(x, y) \in S$.

Definition 2.1. *If* $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}^2$*, we write* $\mathrm{field}(S)$ *for* $\{x \mid \exists y (x, y) \in S$ *or* $(y, x) \in S\}$*. We often write* xSy *for* $(x, y) \in S$*. We write* S_x *for* $\{y \mid (x, y) \in S\}$*.*

By a partial order*, we mean a set* $\prec \subseteq \mathbb{N}^2$ *such that:*

(1) *If* $x \prec y$ *and* $y \prec z$ *then* $x \prec z$*,*
(2) $x \not\prec x$ *for any* x*.*

We say $\prec$ *is a* linear ordering *if for every* $x, y \in \mathrm{field}(\prec)$*, either* $x \prec y$*,* $x = y$*, or* $y \prec x$*.*

When $\prec$ *is a partial order, we write* $\preceq$ *for the reflexive closure of* $\prec$*.*

We always use $<$ to denote the usual ordering on $\mathbb{N}$. We often refer to orderings by a name for the field of the ordering, leaving the underlying order implicit. For instance, we will refer to a linear order α, and to the actual relation as $\prec_\alpha$.

Definition 2.2. *A* sequence from S *is a function from a (proper or improper) initial segment of* $\mathbb{N}$ *to* S*. A* finite sequence *is a sequence whose domain is finite while an* infinite sequence *is a sequence whose domain is* $\mathbb{N}$*. For any* n*, we write* $\sigma \upharpoonright n$ *for* $\sigma \upharpoonright [0, n]$*. We write* $\langle q_0, \ldots, q_n\rangle$ *for the sequence with* $dom(\langle q_0, \ldots, q_n\rangle) = [0, n-1]$ *and* $\langle q_0, \ldots, q_n\rangle(i) = q_i$*. When* σ *is a finite sequence, we write* $|\sigma|$ *for* $|\operatorname{dom}(\sigma)|$*.*

If σ, τ *are sequences, we write* $\sigma \sqsubseteq \tau$ *to indicate that* $\operatorname{dom}(\sigma) \subseteq \operatorname{dom}(\tau)$ *and for all* $i \in \operatorname{dom}(\sigma)$*,* $\sigma(i) = \tau(i)$*. If* σ *is a finite sequence, we write* $\sigma^\frown\tau$ *for the concatenation of* σ *and* τ*,* $\operatorname{dom}(\sigma^\frown\tau) = \operatorname{dom}(\sigma) \cup \{|\sigma| + n \mid n \in \operatorname{dom}(\tau)\}$*,* $(\sigma^\frown\tau)(i) = \sigma(i)$ *if* $i < |\sigma|$ *and* $(\sigma^\frown\tau)(i) = \tau(i - |\sigma|)$ *if* $i \geq |\sigma|$*.*

If $\prec$ *is a partial order on* S*, we extend* $\prec$ *to sequences from* S *by setting* $\sigma \prec \tau$ *if there is an* $\upsilon^\frown\langle n\rangle \sqsubset \sigma, \upsilon^\frown\langle m\rangle \sqsubset \tau$ *where* $n \prec m$*.*

We generally use letters σ, τ for finite sequences and Λ for infinite sequences.

Definition 2.3. *If* $\prec$ *is a partial order, we say* $\prec$ *is* well-founded*, sometimes written* $WF(\prec)$*, if there is no infinite sequence* Λ *such that* $\Lambda(i+1) \prec \Lambda(i)$ *for all* i*. If* $\prec$ *is both well-founded and linearly ordered, we say* $\prec$ *is* well-ordered*, written* $WO(\prec)$*.*

If $\prec$ *is not well-founded,* $\prec$ *is* ill-founded*.*

We equate $\gamma \in \mathrm{field}(\prec_\alpha) = \alpha$ with $\{\delta \in \mathrm{field}(\alpha) \mid \delta \prec_\alpha \gamma\}$.

Definition 2.4. *A* tree *of sequences is a set* T *of finite sequences such that if* $\sigma \in T$ *and* $\tau \sqsubseteq \sigma$ *then* $\tau \in T$*. A* path *through* T *is an infinite sequence* Λ *such that for all* n*,* $\Lambda \upharpoonright n \in T$*.*

We say T *is* well-founded *if there does not exist a path through* T*.*

Equivalently, T is well-founded iff the restriction of $\sqsupset$ to T is a well-founded partial order.

We make extensive use in this paper of the standard systems of Reverse Mathematics, particularly $\mathbf{RCA_0}$, $\mathbf{ACA_0}$, $\mathbf{ATR_0}$, and $\mathbf{\Pi^1_1\text{-}CA_0}$. [14] is the standard reference.

Definition 2.5. *If* Y *is a set and* $\prec$ *is a partial order, for any* $j \in \mathrm{field}(\prec)$ *we write* $(Y)^j = \{(m, i) \in Y \mid i \prec j\}$ *and* $(Y)_j = \{m \mid (m, j) \in Y\}$*.*

If $\theta(x, Y, \vec{z}, \vec{Z})$ *is a formula with the displayed free variables, we write* $H_\theta(\alpha, Y, \vec{z}, \vec{Z})$ *for the formula which says that for every* $j \in \alpha$ *with* $j \neq 0$*,* $(Y)_j = \{x \mid \theta(x, (Y)^j, \vec{z}, \vec{Z})\}$*. When* θ *is a universal* Σ_1 *formula, we just write* $H(\alpha, Y, \vec{Z})$*, omitting the other parameters.*

Recall that the main axiom of $\mathbf{ATR_0}$ is $\forall\alpha(WO(\alpha)\rightarrow\exists Y H_\theta(\alpha,Y))$.

Definition 2.6. *If ϕ is a formula, $TI(\alpha,\phi)$ is the formula stating that transfinite induction for ϕ holds along α:*

$$\forall x\in\mathrm{field}(\alpha)\,[\forall y\prec_\alpha x\phi(y)\rightarrow\phi(x)]\rightarrow\forall x\in\mathrm{field}(\alpha)\phi(x).$$

3. PRINCIPLES AND CLAIMS

In this section we introduce the main principles we will work with through the rest of this paper.

Definition 3.1. *Let T be a tree of sequences and let $\prec$ be a partial order. A path Λ through T is* minimal *(with respect to $\prec$) if there is no path Λ' through T such that $\Lambda'\prec\Lambda$.*

$\mathbf{MPP_0}$ *is the theory consisting of* $\mathbf{RCA_0}$ *together with the* minimal path principle*:*

> *If T is an ill-founded tree of sequences and $\prec$ is well-founded then there exists a minimal path through T.*

$\mathbf{LPP_0}$ *is* $\mathbf{RCA_0}$ *together with the restriction of the minimal path principle to the case where $\prec$ is the usual ordering $<$ on the natural numbers. We call this the* leftmost path principle.

We will later show that the minimal and leftmost path principles are equivalent (Theorem 4.4), and in a computable way, so in all the variants we introduce, there will be no difference between the minimal and leftmost versions.

The following is proved in [8]:

Theorem 3.2 ($\mathbf{RCA_0}$)**.** $\mathbf{LPP_0}$ *is equivalent to* $\mathbf{\Pi^1_1}$-$\mathbf{CA_0}$.

We introduce a family of restricted forms of $\mathbf{MPP_0}$ and $\mathbf{LPP_0}$:

Definition 3.3. *For any n,* $\mathbf{\Sigma}_n$-$\mathbf{MPP_0}$ *is* $\mathbf{RCA_0}$ *together with the* Σ_n-relative minimal path principle*:*

> *Whenever T is an ill-founded tree of finite sequences and $\prec$ is a well-founded partial order, there is a path Λ through T such that there is no path Λ' through T which is Σ_n in $T\oplus\Lambda$ such that $\Lambda'\prec\Lambda$.*

$\mathbf{\Sigma}_n$-$\mathbf{LPP_0}$ *is* $\mathbf{RCA_0}$ *together with the restriction of the Σ_n-relative minimal path principle to the case where $\prec$ is $<$.*

When we take $\mathbf{ATR_0}$ to be our base theory, we may extend this definition to higher levels of the jump hierarchy. We will see later that even $\mathbf{\Sigma}_0$-$\mathbf{LPP_0}$ implies $\mathbf{ATR_0}$.

Definition 3.4. *Let α be a well ordering.* $\mathbf{\Sigma}_\alpha$-$\mathbf{MPP_0}$ *is* $\mathbf{RCA_0}$ *together with the* Σ_α-relative minimal path principle*:*

> *Whenever T is an ill-founded tree of finite sequences and $\prec$ is a well-founded partial order, there is a path Λ through T and a S satisfying $H(\alpha,S,T\oplus\Lambda)$ such that no index of S is a path through T to the left of Λ.*

Finally, $\mathbf{TMPP_0}$ *is* $\mathbf{RCA_0}$ *together with the* transfinite minimal path principle

> *Whenever α is a well-founded ordering,* $\mathbf{\Sigma}_\alpha$-$\mathbf{MPP_0}$ *holds.*

$\mathbf{\Sigma}_\alpha$-$\mathbf{LPP_0}$ *and* $\mathbf{TLPP_0}$ *are the restrictions of* $\mathbf{\Sigma}_\alpha$-$\mathbf{MPP_0}$ *and* $\mathbf{TMPP_0}$ *respectively to the case where $\prec$ is $<$.*

Note that $\mathbf{TMPP_0}$ and $\mathbf{TLPP_0}$ are axiomitized by Π^1_2 formulas.

The minimal path principle is inconvenient to analyze, and for that purpose we will introduce some convenient theories of transfinite induction.

Definition 3.5. *A formula is* Π^1_1*, which we will also write* $\Sigma_0(\Pi^1_1)$*, if it has the form*

$$\forall X\phi(X)$$

where ϕ *contains no set quantifiers. A formula is* $\Sigma_{n+1}(\Pi^1_1)$ *if it has the form* $\exists x\phi(x)$ *where* ϕ *is built from* Π^1_1 *formulas using propositional connectives (*$\wedge, \vee, \rightarrow$*, and* $\neg$*).*

We write $\mathbf{\Sigma}_n(\mathbf{\Pi^1_1})\text{-}\mathbf{TI_0}$ *for* $\mathbf{ACA_0}$ *together with the scheme:*

$$\forall\beta(WF(\beta)\rightarrow TI(\beta,\phi))$$

whenever ϕ *is a* $\Sigma_n(\Pi^1_1)$ *formula.*

Note that a formula is $A\Pi^1_1$ exactly if the formula is $\Sigma_n(\Pi^1_1)$ for some n. In particular, $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{<\omega}(\mathbf{\Pi^1_1})\text{-}\mathbf{TI_0}$ is precisely the theory $\mathbf{A\Pi^1_1}-\mathbf{TI_0}$, which is known to have the same proof-theoretic strength as $\mathbf{\Pi^1_1}\text{-}\mathbf{CA_0^-}$ (see [14]).

We would like to extend this hierarchy to ordinals without adding comprehension over Π^1_1 formulas. Since we only use this hierarcy to calibrate the strength of $\mathbf{TMPP_0}$, we take a simple but indirect approach.

Definition 3.6. *Let* M *be a model of second order arithmetic and let* α *be a well-ordering. We say* M *satisfies* $\mathbf{\Sigma}_\alpha(\mathbf{\Pi^1_1})\text{-}\mathbf{TI_0}$ *if whenever* $\phi(X)$ *is an arithmetic formula,* $Z=\{n\mid\phi(M_n)\}$*,* $H(\alpha,Y,Z)$*,* $M\vDash WF(M_i)$*, and* W *is computable from* Y*, then* $TI(M_i,W)$*.*

Note that $\mathbf{\Sigma}_\alpha(\mathbf{\Pi^1_1})\text{-}\mathbf{TI_0}$ is not a theory in the language of second order arithmetic, however it is convenient, within a ground model N of second order arithmetic, to discuss whether some countably coded ω-model M satisfies $\mathbf{\Sigma}_\alpha(\mathbf{\Pi^1_1})\text{-}\mathbf{TI_0}$. In particular, when N satisfies $\mathbf{ATR_0}$ and $WO(\alpha)$, M satisfying $\mathbf{\Sigma}_\alpha(\mathbf{\Pi^1_1})\text{-}\mathbf{TI_0}$ is a sensible notion defined by a sentence of second order arithmetic.

4. LOWER BOUNDS ON THE LEFTMOST PATH PRINCIPLE

We show that even the weakest principle we are considering, $\mathbf{\Sigma}_0\text{-}\mathbf{LPP_0}$, is fairly strong. We begin by showing that it implies $\mathbf{ACA_0}$, which will let us use arithmetic comprehension in later proofs, and illustrate our general method.

Theorem 4.1 ($\mathbf{RCA_0}$). $\mathbf{\Sigma}_0\text{-}\mathbf{LPP_0}$ *implies* $\mathbf{ACA_0}$.[†]

Proof. It suffices to prove Σ_1 comprehension. Let $\phi(x,y)$ be a Σ_0 formula (possibly with parameters). We say a finite sequence σ from $\{0,1\}$ is *valid* if for each $i<|\sigma|$,

$$\sigma(i)=0\Rightarrow\forall j<|\sigma|\neg\phi(i,j).$$

Consider the tree T of valid finite sequences; T is clearly computable from its parameters, and is ill-founded since the function given by $\Lambda_0(i)=1$ for all i is an infinite path through this tree.

Note that if Λ is any infinite path through T and $\Lambda(i)=0$ then $\forall y\neg\phi(i,y,S)$: if $\phi(i,m,S)$ then we cannot have any $\sigma\in T$ with $|\sigma|>m$ and $\sigma(i)=0$.

By $\mathbf{\Sigma}_0\text{-}\mathbf{LPP_0}$, we may find a path Λ so that no infinite path Λ' computable from Λ is to the left of Λ. Suppose $\{i\mid\Lambda(i)>0\}\neq\{i\mid\exists y\phi(i,y,S)\}$. Since $\Lambda(i)=0$ implies

---

[†] The simplified construction here was pointed out to us by Stephen Simpson.

$\forall y \neg\phi(i, y, S)$, it must be that there is some i with $\Lambda(i) > 0$ but $\forall y \neg\phi(i, y, S)$. But then the function

$$\Lambda'(j) = \begin{cases} \Lambda(j) & \text{if } j \neq i \\ 0 & \text{if } j = i \end{cases}$$

is also an infinite path through T and easily computable from Λ. But $\Lambda' < \Lambda$, contradicting the fact that Λ was relatively leftmost. ☐

Theorem 4.2 ($\mathbf{RCA_0}$). $\mathbf{\Sigma}_0$-$\mathbf{LPP_0}$ *implies* $\mathbf{ATR_0}$.

Proof. It suffices to show transfinite recursion over Σ_1 formulas. Suppose $WO(\alpha)$ and let $\theta(x) = \exists y \phi(x, y, Y)$; we will show that $\exists Y H_\theta(\alpha, Y)$. Note that since ϕ is Σ_0, for any i, Y such that $\exists y \phi(i, y, Y)$ holds, there is an m such that for any Y' such that $\chi_{Y'} \upharpoonright m = \chi_Y \upharpoonright m$, $\exists y < m \phi(i, y, Y')$.

We will again consider a tree of potential characteristic functions for Y. A finite sequence of natural numbers is *valid* if:

- For any $\gamma \in \mathrm{field}(\alpha)$ and any i such that $\sigma((i, \gamma)) = 0$, there is some Y such that $\chi_Y \upharpoonright \mathrm{dom}(\sigma) = \sigma$ and $\forall y < |\sigma| \neg\phi(i, y, (Y)^\gamma)$,
- If $\sigma((i, \gamma)) > 1$ then there is some Y such that $\chi_Y \upharpoonright \mathrm{dom}(\sigma) = \sigma$ and $\phi(i, \sigma((i, \gamma)) - 2, (Y)^\gamma)$,
- If there are j, δ such that $(j, \delta) < (i, \gamma)$, $\delta >_\alpha \gamma$, and $\sigma(j, \delta) \neq 1$ then $\sigma((i, \gamma)) \neq 1$.

Note that, since ϕ is a computable formula, these conditions are arithmetic (indeed, computable), despite the apparent set quantifier.

The idea is that when $\sigma((i, \gamma)) = 0$, the universal formula should be true, and when $\sigma((i, \gamma)) > 0$, the existential should be true. When $\sigma((i, \gamma)) = 1$, the existential quantifier is "unjustified": no witness is required. When $\sigma((i, \gamma)) > 1$, however, a witness is required, and $\sigma((i, \gamma)) - 2$ should be such a witness.

The final condition in the construction of the tree is perhaps the least obvious; the point is that when we set $\sigma((i, \gamma)) = 0$, we might be depending on the fact that $\sigma((j, \delta)) = 1$ for some $\delta <_\alpha \gamma$ but j much larger than i so that $(i, \gamma) < (j, \delta)$. If we wanted to fix a potential characteristic function by setting $\sigma((j, \delta)) = 0$, we would have to restore $\sigma((i, \gamma)) = 1$, and since (i, γ) appears below (j, δ), we are no longer moving to the left. Our solution is to require that once we set $\sigma((i, \gamma)) \neq 1$ in a path, we are supposed to be certain about (j, δ) whenever $\delta <_\alpha \gamma$. This is enforced by requiring that we actually provide witnesses to existential formulas of all lower ranks.

There are no requirements when $\sigma(x) = 1$, so the function $\Lambda_0(x) = 1$ for all x is an infinite path through this tree. By $\mathbf{\Sigma}_0$-$\mathbf{LPP_0}$, we may find a relatively leftmost path Λ. Let $Y = \{i \mid \Lambda(i) > 0\}$. Since $\mathbf{ACA_0}$ satisfies arithmetic transfinite induction, we show by induction on $\gamma \in \alpha$ that $(Y)_\gamma = \{i \mid \exists y \phi(i, y, (Y)^\gamma\}$. Assume that $H_\theta(\gamma, (Y)^\gamma)$ holds.

Suppose $\exists y \phi(i, y, (Y)^\gamma)$. Then there is some m such that whenever $\chi_{Y'} \upharpoonright m = \chi_Y \upharpoonright m$, $\exists y < m \phi(i, y, (Y')^\gamma)$. Then we cannot have $\Lambda((i, \gamma)) = 0$, so $\Lambda((i, \gamma)) > 0$ and therefore $i \in (Y)_\gamma$.

Suppose $\forall y \neg\phi(i, y, (Y)^\gamma)$. If $\Lambda((i, \gamma)) > 1$, there would be some m such that whenever $\chi_{Y'} \upharpoonright m = \chi_Y \upharpoonright m$, $\phi(i, \Lambda((i, \gamma)) - 2, (Y')^\gamma)$, contradicting the requirement on sequences in our tree. If $\Lambda((i, \gamma)) = 0$, $i \notin (Y)_\gamma$ as desired. So suppose $\Lambda((i, \gamma)) = 1$.

Observe that for $\delta <_\alpha \gamma$, we have $(Y)_\delta = \{i \mid \exists y \phi(i, y, (Y)^\delta\}$. In particular, if $\Lambda((j, \delta)) = 1$ and $\delta <_\alpha \gamma$ then there must be some y such that $\exists y \phi(i, y, (Y)^\delta)$, and we may therefore computably (in $(Y)^\delta$) find such a y; we name this value $y(j,\delta)$. We define

$$\Lambda'((j,\delta)) = \begin{cases} y(j,\delta)+2 & \text{if } \delta <_\alpha \gamma, \Lambda((j,\delta))=1, \text{ and } (i,\gamma)<(j,\delta) \\ \Lambda((j,\delta)) & \text{if } \delta <_\alpha \gamma \text{ and either } \Lambda((j,\delta)) \neq 1 \text{ or } (j,\delta)<(i,\gamma) \\ 1 & \text{if } \delta >_\alpha \gamma \\ \Lambda((j,\delta)) & \text{if } \delta = \gamma \text{ and } j \neq i \\ 0 & \text{if } j=i \text{ and } \delta=\gamma \end{cases}.$$

Note that $\Lambda' < \Lambda$: if $(j,\delta)<(i,\gamma)$ and $\delta \leq_\alpha \gamma$ then $\Lambda'((j,\delta)) = \Lambda((j,\delta))$ by definition, while if $\delta >_\alpha \gamma$ then, since Λ satisfied the third condition in the definition of the tree, we must have had $\Lambda((j,\delta)) = 1 = \Lambda'((j,\delta))$.

We check that Λ' is an infinite path through T; let $Y' = \{i \mid \Lambda'(i) > 0\}$. let $\sigma \sqsubset \Lambda'$ be a finite initial segment. Suppose $\sigma((j,\delta)) = 0$; then $\delta \leq_\alpha \gamma$ and either $\Lambda((j,\delta)) = 0$ or $(i,\gamma) = (j,\delta)$, and since $(Y')^\gamma = (Y)^\gamma$ and $\forall y \neg\phi(j,y,(Y)^\gamma)$, also $\forall y\neg\phi(j,y,(Y')^\gamma)$.

If $\sigma((j,\delta)) > 1$ then again $\delta \leq_\alpha \gamma$ and $\phi(j,\Lambda'((j,\delta))-2,(Y)^\delta)$, so $\phi(j,\Lambda'((j,\delta))-2,(Y')^\delta)$.

Finally, if there is any $(j',\delta') < (j,\delta)$ with $\delta <_\alpha \delta'$ and $\sigma((j',\delta')) \neq 1$, we have $\delta <_\alpha \delta' \leq_\alpha \gamma$, and therefore $\sigma((j,\delta)) \neq 1$.

So Λ' is an infinite path computable from Λ and to the left of Λ, which contradicts the choice of Λ. □

Finally, we give our main lower bound on $\mathbf{\Sigma_\alpha}$-$\mathbf{LPP_0}$. The results below show that this bound is almost sharp, leaving a small gap between the amount of transfinite induction needed to obtain $\mathbf{\Sigma_\alpha}$-$\mathbf{LPP_0}$ and the amount implied by $\mathbf{\Sigma_\alpha}$-$\mathbf{LPP_0}$.

Theorem 4.3. *If* $\mathbf{RCA_0}+\mathbf{\Sigma_{\alpha+1}}$-$\mathbf{LPP_0}$ *proves* $WO(\alpha)$ *then* $\mathbf{RCA_0}+\mathbf{\Sigma_{\alpha+1}}$-$\mathbf{LPP_0}$ *proves that there exists a countably coded* ω*-model of* $\mathbf{ACA_0}$ *satisfying* $\mathbf{\Sigma_\alpha(\Pi^1_1)}$-$\mathbf{TI_0}$.

Proof. We will view a sequence Λ as coding a model M by setting $(i,n) \in M$ iff $\Lambda((i,n)) > 0$. Since M will be viewed as a countable coded ω-model, this is saying that $M_i = \{n \mid \Lambda((i,n)) > 0\}$.

In order to ensure closure under arithmetic comprehension, it will be convenient to have a name for the set M_i. We consider an extension of the language of second order logic by countably many new set constants, $S_1,\ldots$. (For technical reasons, it will be convenient to assume that this language has existential quantifiers and negation, but no universal quantifier.) We view M as a model of this extended language by defining $M \vDash n \in S_i$ iff $n \in M_i$.

We will define our tree so that when ϕ is an arithmetic formula in this language with a single free variable, the set $M_{(0,\ulcorner\phi\urcorner)} = \{n \mid M \vDash \phi(n)\}$. This will ensure that we have a model of $\mathbf{ACA_0}$. (When we define conditions below, we fix a variable and only discuss $M_{0,\ulcorner\phi\urcorner}$ where no other variables occur free in ϕ; there are no conditions on other cases.)

The new complication will be ensuring that the model satisfies $\mathbf{\Sigma_\alpha(\Pi^1_1)}$-$\mathbf{TI_0}$. Suppose M were not a model of $\mathbf{\Sigma_\alpha(\Pi^1_1)}$-$\mathbf{TI_0}$; then there would be some arithmetic $\phi(X,x)$, some n, and a sequence Υ, Σ_α in $\{j \mid \forall i\phi(M_i,j)\}$, such that Z is an infinite descending sequence in M_n. (The key point, of course, will be that Z is $\Sigma_{\alpha+1}$ in M.) We will ensure that if $M_{(2,n)}$ is non-trivial then it is some descending sequence in M_n. (We will also use $M_{(1,n)}$ to make the coding easier.)

We will handle the dependencies of one set on another in a similar manner to the previous theorem. For this purpose, we define

- $lvl((0,\ulcorner t \in S_i\urcorner)) = lvl(i)+1$,
- $lvl((0,\ulcorner\phi\urcorner)) = 0$ if ϕ is atomic and not of the form $t \in S_i$,

- $lvl((0,\ulcorner\neg\phi\urcorner)) = lvl((0,\ulcorner\phi\urcorner))+1$,
- $lvl((0,\ulcorner\phi\wedge\psi\urcorner)) = lvl((0,\ulcorner\phi\vee\psi\urcorner)) = \max\{lvl((0,\ulcorner\phi\urcorner)), lvl((0,\ulcorner\psi\urcorner))\}+1$,
- $lvl((0,\ulcorner\exists x\phi\urcorner)) = lvl((0,\ulcorner\forall x\phi\urcorner)) = lvl((0,\ulcorner\phi[0/x]\urcorner))+1$,
- $lvl((1,n)) = lvl(n)+1$,
- $lvl((2,n)) = lvl(n)+1$,
- $lvl((i,j)) = 0$ in all other cases.

We say a sequence σ is *valid* if whenever $\sigma(((i,j),k))$ is defined:

- If $i=0$ and $j=\ulcorner t\in S_n\urcorner$ then $\sigma(((i,j),k)) = \sigma((n,k))$,
- If $i=0$ and $j=\ulcorner\phi\urcorner$ where ϕ is atomic and not of the form $t\in S_i$ then $\sigma(((i,j),k)) = 1$ if ϕ is true and 0 if ϕ is false,
- If $i=0$ and $j=\ulcorner\neg\phi\urcorner$ then $\sigma(((i,j),k)) = 1$ if $\sigma(((i,\ulcorner\phi\urcorner),k)) = 0$ and 0 otherwise,
- If $i=0$ and $j=\ulcorner\phi\wedge\psi\urcorner$ then $\sigma(((i,j),k)) = 1$ if both $\sigma(((0,\ulcorner\phi\urcorner),k))>0$ and $\sigma(((0,\ulcorner\psi\urcorner),k))>0$, and 0 otherwise,
- If $i=0$, $j=\ulcorner\exists x\phi\urcorner$, and $\sigma(((i,j),k))=0$ then there is no $u<|\sigma|$ such that $\sigma(((i,\ulcorner\phi(u)\urcorner),k))>0$,
- If $i=0$, $j=\ulcorner\exists x\phi\urcorner$, $\sigma(((i,j),k))>1$, and $\sigma(((i,\ulcorner\phi(\sigma(((i,j),k))-2)\urcorner),k))$ is defined then $\sigma(((i,\ulcorner\phi(\sigma(((i,j),k))-2)\urcorner),k))>0$,
- If $i=1$, $k>0$, and $\sigma(((i,j),0))=0$ then
  1. $\sigma((n,k))$ is a sequence $\langle q_0,\dots,q_k\rangle$,
  2. Whenever $i<k$ and $\sigma((m,(q_{i+1},q_i)))$ is defined, $\sigma((j,(q_{i+1},q_i)))>0$,
  3. If $k>1$ then $\sigma((n,k-1))\sqsubset\sigma((n,k))$.
- If $i=2$ and $\sigma(((1,j),0))=0$ then $\sigma(((2,j),(k,q)))=1$ if $\sigma(((1,j),k))=q$ and 0 otherwise.

It is easy to construct an infinite path through this tree (the sequence constantly 1 will no longer work, because of the conditions for atomic formulas, $\wedge$, and $\neg$, but these cases are easily dealt with).

Let Λ be the path given by $\mathbf{\Sigma_{\alpha+1}\text{-}LPP_0}$. We show that for all n,

1. If $n=(0,\ulcorner\phi\urcorner)$, $M_n=\{i\mid M\vDash\phi(i)\}$,
2. If $n=(2,m)$ and there is any infinite decreasing sequence in M_m which is $\Sigma_{\alpha+1}$ in M then M_n is such a sequence.

Naturally, we proceed by induction on $lvl(n)$. The first claim is identical to the argument in the previous theorem. The second claim is obtained by a similar argument: suppose there is an infinite decreasing sequence Υ in M_m which is $\Sigma_{\alpha+1}$ in M. By construction, if M_n is not such a sequence, we have $\sigma(((1,m),0))\neq 0$, so we obtain a new sequence Λ' by setting $\Lambda'(((1,m),0))=0$, $\Lambda'(((1,m),k+1))=\Upsilon\upharpoonright k+2$, and $\Lambda'(((2,m),k))=\Upsilon(k)$, and resetting everything of higher level. Note that any component which depends on the values at $M_{(1,m)}$ or $M_{(2,m)}$ (for instance, sets defined by formulas containing the constant $S_{(2,m)}$) has a higher index then m, and therefore all its indices are greater than $((1,m),0)$. Since $\Lambda'(((1,m),0))<\Lambda(((1,m),0))$ and Λ' is $\Sigma_{\alpha+1}$ in M, we obtain a contradiction, so M_n was already an infinite descending sequence in M_m, concluding the induction.

This immediately gives that M is a model of $\mathbf{ACA_0}$. To see that M satisfies $\mathbf{\Sigma_\alpha(\Pi^1_1)\text{-}TI_0}$, observe that if that if $Y=\{n\mid M\vDash\forall X\phi(X,n)\}$ then Y is Π^0_1 in M, and therefore any set Σ_α in Y is $\Sigma_{\alpha+1}$ in M. In particular, any set $\Sigma_\alpha(\Pi^1_1)$ is $\Sigma_{\alpha+1}$ in M. It follows that M satisfies $\mathbf{\Sigma_\alpha(\Pi^1_1)\text{-}TI_0}$. $\square$

Before continuing, we note that there is no difference in strength between the leftmost and minimal path principle.

Theorem 4.4 ($\mathbf{RCA_0}$). (1) $\mathbf{LPP_0}$ *is equivalent to* $\mathbf{MPP_0}$.
(2) *For any* α, $\mathbf{\Sigma}_\alpha$-$\mathbf{LPP_0}$ *is equivalent to* $\mathbf{\Sigma}_\alpha$-$\mathbf{MPP_0}$.
(3) $\mathbf{TLPP_0}$ *is equivalent to* $\mathbf{TMPP_0}$.

Proof. The right to left directions are all trivial. We prove the left to right direction.

Let $\prec$ be a well-founded partial order. Since even $\mathbf{\Sigma}_0$-$\mathbf{LPP_0}$ implies $\mathbf{ACA_0}$, we may assume that $\prec$ is actually a linear order. (More precisely, we define $x \prec' y$ to hold if either $x \prec y$ or x, y are incomparable and $x < y$, and then use Ramsey's Theorem for Pairs, provable in $\mathbf{ACA_0}$, to show that $\prec'$ is well-ordered.)

We define a computable map π from $\mathrm{field}(\prec) \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ to $\mathbb{N}^{<\omega}$ such that if $x \prec y$ then $\pi(x) < \pi(y)$. We first define an auxiliary map π' inductively. π' will have the property that its image consists only of sequences of even numbers followed by a single odd number. We define π' by the following algorithm: let y be given and suppose $\pi'(x)$ has been defined for all $x < y$. If there is any $x < y$ such that $y \prec x$, choose x $\prec$-least such that this holds, so $\pi'(x) = \sigma^\frown\langle n\rangle$, and set $\pi'(y) = \sigma^\frown\langle n-1, m\rangle$ where m is the smallest odd number so $\pi'(y) \neq \pi'(z)$ for $z < y$. If there is no such x, set $\pi'(y) = \langle m\rangle$ where m is again the smallest odd number so $\pi'(y) \neq \pi'(z)$ for $z < y$.

Claim 1. *If* $x \prec y$ *then* $\pi'(x) < \pi'(y)$.

Proof. We proceed by induction on the maximum of x and y with respect to $<$.

Suppose $y < x$. We proceed by side induction on y along $\prec$, so assume that whenever $z < x$ and $x \prec z \prec y$, $\pi'(x) < \pi'(z)$. First, assume there is no such z, so y is $\prec$-least such that $x \prec y$ and $y < x$. Then for some σ, n, $\pi'(y) = \sigma^\frown\langle n\rangle$ while $\pi'(x) = \sigma^\frown\langle n-1, m\rangle$ for some m, so certainly $\pi'(x) < \pi'(y)$. Otherwise, there is some $z < x$ such that $x \prec z \prec y$; then we have $\pi'(z) < \pi'(y)$ by main IH and $\pi'(x) < \pi'(z)$ by side IH, so $\pi'(x) < \pi'(y)$.

Suppose $x < y$. Suppose there is some $z < y$ such that $y \prec z$, and let z be $\prec$-least such that this is the case. Then by IH, $\pi'(x) < \pi'(z) = \sigma^\frown\langle n\rangle$ while $\pi'(y) = \sigma^\frown\langle n-1, m\rangle$. If $\sigma^\frown\langle n-1, m'\rangle \sqsubset \pi'(x)$ for some m' then we have $m' < m$, so $\pi'(x) < \pi'(y)$. Otherwise, since $\pi'(x) < \sigma^\frown\langle n\rangle$, we must have $\pi'(x) < \sigma$ and therefore $\pi'(x) < \pi'(y)$. If there is no such z, $\pi'(y) = \langle m\rangle$ while $\pi'(x) = \langle n\rangle^\frown\sigma$ where $n < m$, so again $\pi'(x) < \pi'(y)$. $\dashv$

Claim 2. *If* $\pi'(x) < \pi'(y)$ *then* $x \prec y$.

Proof. Since $\prec$ is a linear order, if $x \not\prec y$ then either $x = y$, in which case $\pi'(x) \not< \pi'(y)$, or $y \prec x$ in which case $\pi'(y) < \pi'(x)$, so $\pi'(x) \not< \pi'(y)$. $\dashv$

Claim 3. $\{\sigma \mid \exists x \sigma \sqsubseteq \pi'(x)\}$ *is well-founded.*

Proof. Suppose not, and let $\sigma_0 \sqsupset \sigma_1 \sqsupset \cdots$ be an infinite descending sequence. Since odd numbers are always terminal, each σ_i consists only of even numbers. Note that, by construction of π', if $\sigma_i = \tau_i^\frown\langle n-1\rangle$, there must be some x_i such that $\pi'(x_i) = \tau_i^\frown\langle n\rangle$. We must have $\sigma_i \sqsubset \pi'(x_{i+1})$, and therefore $\pi'(x_{i+1}) < \pi(x_i)$, so $x_{i+1} \prec x_i$. Therefore the x_i form an infinite descending sequence through $\prec$, contradicting the fact that $\prec$ is well-founded. $\dashv$

Now we define $\pi(x) = \pi'(x)^\frown\langle x\rangle$. (The purpose of this suffix is to ensure that the inverse map is computable.) Given a sequence σ, define $\pi(\sigma)$ inductively by $\pi(\langle\rangle) = \langle\rangle$ and $\pi(\sigma^\frown\langle n\rangle) = \pi(\sigma)^\frown\pi(n)$. π is clearly injective.

Now let T be an ill-founded tree of finite sequences and define $T' = \{\sigma \mid \exists\tau \in T \sigma \sqsubseteq \pi(\tau)\}$. Since $\mathbf{\Sigma}_0$-$\mathbf{LPP_0}$ implies $\mathbf{ACA_0}$, T' exists. If Λ is an infinite path through T, $\pi(\Lambda)$ is an infinite path through T', so T' is ill-founded.

Claim 4. *If Λ' is a path through T', there is a unique path Λ through T such that $\pi(\Lambda) = \Lambda'$, and Λ' is computable from Λ.*

Proof. Note that, since $\{\sigma \mid \exists x \sigma \sqsubseteq \pi(x)\}$ is well-founded, all subsequences of Λ' consisting only of even numbers must be finite. Then we may uniquely decompose Λ' into a sequence of blocks

$$\Lambda' = \sigma_0^\frown \langle n_0, m_0\rangle^\frown \sigma_1^\frown \langle n_1, m_1\rangle \cdots$$

where σ_i consists only of even numbers and n_i is odd. Then for each i, we must have $\pi(m_i) = \sigma_i^\frown \langle n_i\rangle$, so setting $\Lambda(i) = m_i$, we have $\pi(\Lambda) = \Lambda'$. ⊣

Let Λ' be a path through T' given by $\mathbf{LPP_0}$ and let Λ be the unique path through T such that $\pi(\Lambda) = \Lambda'$. If $\Lambda^* \prec \Lambda$ then $\pi(\Lambda^*) < \Lambda'$, contradicting the choice of Λ. The second and third parts of the claim follow since if Λ^* is Σ_α in Λ, $\pi(\Lambda^*)$ is Σ_α in Λ'. □

4.1. **Models of $\mathbf{\Sigma^1_1}$-$\mathbf{DC_0}$.** In this section we follow almost exactly the notation of [14, Chapter VIII.4]

Definition 4.5. *We write $\mathcal{O}_+(a, X)$ to mean that $a = (e, i)$ for some e and i and that e is an X-recursive index of an X-recursive linear ordering $\leq^X_e$ and $i \in \mathrm{field}(<^X_e)$. If $\mathcal{O}_+(a, X)$ and $\mathcal{O}_+(b, X)$, we write $b <^X_{\mathcal{O}} a$ to mean that $a = (e, i)$, $b = (e, j)$, and $j <^X_e i$.*

We write $\mathcal{O}(a, X)$ to mean that $\mathcal{O}_+(a, X)$ and there is no infinite sequence (a_i) such that $a = a_0 >^X_{\mathcal{O}} a_1 >^X_{\mathcal{O}} > \cdots$.

Theorem 4.6 ($\mathbf{TLPP_0}$)**.** *If T is an ill-founded tree of sequences and $\prec$ is well-founded then there is a countable coded ω-model M such that $T \in M$, M satisfies $\mathbf{\Sigma^1_1}$-$\mathbf{DC_0}$, and M satisfies that there is a $\prec$-minimal path through T.*

Proof. We first carry out the proof of Lemma VIII.4.18 of [14], taking into account that we need to also include a path through T which will become our $\prec$-minimal path.

Let $\mathcal{O}_1(a, T)$ be a Σ^1_1 formula stating that there is an infinite path Λ through T such that:

1. $\mathcal{O}_+(a, T)$,
2. There is a countably coded ω-model M of $\mathbf{ACA_0}$ such that $T \in M$, $\Lambda \in M$, and M satisfies $\mathcal{O}(a, T) \wedge \exists Y H(a, Y, T \oplus \Lambda)$ and M satisfies that Λ is a $\prec$-minimal path through T.

If $\mathcal{O}(a, T)$ holds then certainly $\mathcal{O}_1(a, T)$, $a = (e, i)$, and since $<^T_e \upharpoonright i$ is a well-order, there is a Λ such that no path computable in a Y satisfying $H(a, Y, T \oplus \Lambda)$ is $\prec \Lambda$. Since $\mathbf{TLPP_0}$ implies $\mathbf{ATR_0}$, we have some Y such that $H(a, Y, T \oplus \Lambda)$, and we may take M to be the set of sets Turing reducible to Y.

Since $\mathcal{O}_1(a, T)$ is Σ^1_1, $\mathcal{O}_1(a, T)$ cannot be equivalent to $\mathcal{O}(a, T)$, so there is an a^* such that $\mathcal{O}_1(a^*, T)$, and therefore an ω-model M^* of $\mathbf{ACA_0}$ such that $T \in M^*$, $\Lambda \in M^*$, M^* satisfies $\mathcal{O}(a^*, T)$, M^* satisfies $\exists Y H(a^*, T \oplus \Lambda, Y)$, and M^* satisfies that Λ is a $\prec$-minimal path through T.

The proof of Lemma VIII.4.19 of [14] now shows that there is a model $M \subseteq M^*$ of $\mathbf{\Sigma^1_1}$-$\mathbf{DC_0}$ containing T and Λ; it follows that M believes Λ is a $\prec$-minimal path through T. □

5. HIGMAN'S AND KRUSKAL'S THEOREMS

Definition 5.1. *Q is an* well-quasi-order (wqo) *if Q is a partial order and whenever $\Lambda : \mathbb{N} \to Q$, there are $i < j$ such that $\Lambda(i) \preceq_Q \Lambda(j)$.*

A sequence σ from Q is bad *if there is no $i < j$ such that $\sigma(i) \preceq_Q \sigma(j)$.*

Q is a well-quasi-order iff the tree of bad sequences from Q is well-founded.

Definition 5.2. *If Q is a partial order, $Q^{<\omega}$ is the set of finite sequences from Q and $\prec_Q^\omega$ is given by $\sigma \preceq \tau$ iff there is an order-preserving $\pi : [0, |\sigma| - 1] \to [0, |\tau| - 1]$ such that $\sigma(i) \preceq \tau(\pi(i))$ for all $i < |\sigma|$.*

Nash-Williams gave the following short proof of Higman's Theorem:

Theorem 5.3. *If Q is a wqo then so is $Q^{<\omega}$.*

Proof. Suppose $Q,$ is a wqo but $Q^{<\omega}$ is not. Define $\sigma \leq \tau$ if $|\sigma| \leq |\tau|$. Let Λ be an infinite sequence demonstrating $Q^{<\omega}$ given by the leftmost path principle. Clearly $\Lambda(i) \neq \langle\rangle$ for any i, since then we would have $\Lambda(i) = \langle\rangle \preceq_Q^{<\omega} \Lambda(i+1)$. So we may write $\Lambda(i) = \Lambda'(i)^\frown\langle q(i)\rangle$ for all i. Define $c(i,j) = 0$ iff $q(i) \preceq_Q q(j)$, and $c(i,j) = 1$ otherwise. By Ramsey's Theorem for Pairs, there is an infinite set S such that c is homogeneous on S.

If c were homogeneously 1, the function $q \upharpoonright S$ would give an infinite sequence in Q contradicting the fact that Q is a wqo. So c must be homogeneously 0. If for any $i < j \in S$, $\Lambda'(i) \preceq_Q^{<\omega} \Lambda'(j)$ then we would have $\Lambda(i) \preceq_Q^{<\omega} \Lambda(j)$ since $q(i) \preceq_Q q(j)$. This contradicts the construction of Λ.

Let $\{i_0, i_1, \ldots\}$ be the increasing enumeration of S. Define $\Lambda^*(i) = \Lambda(i)$ if $i < i_0$ and $\Lambda^*(i) = \Lambda'(i_{i-i_0})$ if $i \geq i_0$. Then for any $i < j$, either $i < j < i_0$, so $\Lambda^*(i) = \Lambda(i) \npreceq_Q^{<\omega} \Lambda(j) = \Lambda^*(j)$, or $i < i_0 \leq j$, in which case $\Lambda^*(i) = \Lambda(i) \npreceq_Q^{<\omega} \Lambda(i_{j-i_0}) \succeq_Q^{<\omega} \Lambda^*(j)$, or $i_0 \leq i < j$, in which case $\Lambda^*(i) = \Lambda(i_{i-i_0}) \npreceq_Q^{<\omega} \Lambda(i_{j-i_0}) = \Lambda^*(j)$. So Λ^* is an infinite bad sequence and $\Lambda^* < \Lambda$ contradicting the fact that Λ is a leftmost path. $\square$

We may observe that Λ^* in the proof is Σ_1, and therefore that this proof goes through without change in $\mathbf{\Sigma}_1$-$\mathbf{LPP_0}$.

Schütte and Simpson [11, 13] gave a different proof of Higman's Theorem in $\mathbf{ACA_0}$. Specifically, their proof shows that if $Q^{<\omega}$ is not a wqo then neither is $\omega^{\omega^{Q+1}}$; it follows that if there is an infinite bad sequence Λ from $Q^{<\omega}$ then there is an infinite bad sequence Λ' from Q such that Λ' is Σ_2 in Λ.

We now wish to discuss the proof of Kruskal's Theorem; inconveniently, the proof concerns trees in a slightly different sense than we have been using. To avoid confusion, we will call these K-trees.

Definition 5.4. *A K-*tree *is a finite set T together with a partial order $\leq_T$ such that:*

- *T has a unique root $r \in T$ such that for all $t \in T$, $r \leq_T t$ and if $t \neq r$ then $t \not\leq_T r$, and*
- *If $t \leq_T s$ and $u \leq_T u$ then either $t \leq_T u$ or $u \leq_T t$.*

We write $t \wedge_T u$ for the infimum of t and u, so $t \wedge_T u \leq_T t$, $t \wedge_T u \leq_T u$, and if both $v \leq_T t$ and $v \leq_T u$ then $v \leq_T t \wedge_T u$.

*If Q is a quasi-ordering, a Q-*labeled K-tree *is a pair (T, f) where T is a K-tree and $f : T \to Q$. We define a quasi-ordering $\prec_K$ on Q-labeled K-trees by setting $(T, f) \preceq_K (T', f')$ if there is a function $\pi : T \to T'$ such that for each $t, u \in T$, $\pi(t \wedge_T u) = \pi(t) \wedge_{T'} \pi(u)$ and $f(t) \preceq_Q \pi(f'(t))$.*

Theorem 5.5 ($\mathbf{\Sigma}_2$-$\mathbf{LPP_0}$). *If Q is a wqo then so are the Q-labeled K-trees under $\prec_K$.*

Proof. Suppose Q is a wqo but the Q-labeled K-trees are not. Define $\prec_K^*$ to by setting $(T, f) \prec_K^* (T', f')$ if $|T'| < |T|$. Then the tree of bad sequences of Q-labeled K-trees is ill-founded, so let Λ be a relatively $\prec_K^*$-minimal bad sequence given by $\mathbf{\Sigma}_2$-$\mathbf{LPP_0}$.

Given a Q-labeled K-tree (T, f), let $\mathcal{F}(T, f)$ be the finite set of proper subtrees of (T, f). If T is a tree, write r_T for the root of T and $\sigma_{T,f}$ for the sequence of immediate successors of r (in an arbitrary order). We may equate (T, f) with the pair $(f(r_T), \sigma_{T,f}) \in Q \times \mathcal{F}(T, f)^{<\omega}$. In particular, if $f(r_T) \preceq_Q f'(r_{T'})$ and $\sigma_{T,f} \preceq_K^{<\omega} \sigma_{T',f'}$ then $(T, f) \preceq_K (T', f')$.

For each i, we have $\Lambda(i) = (T_i, f_i)$. For $i < j$, define $c(i, j) = 0$ if $f_i(r_{T_i}) \preceq_Q f_j(r_{T_j})$ and $c(i, j) = 1$ otherwise. Since Q is a wqo, we may restrict Λ to a subsequence of integers where $c(i, j) = 0$. In particular, since $\Lambda(i) \not\preceq_K \Lambda(j)$ when $i < j$, we have $\sigma_{T_i,f_i} \not\preceq_K^{<\omega} \sigma_{T_j,f_j}$.

Let $\mathcal{S} = \bigcup_i \mathcal{F}(\Lambda(i))$. Then Λ gives an infinite bad sequence in $\mathcal{S}^{<\omega}$. By Higman's Theorem, there is an infinite bad sequence $\Lambda'(i)$ through $\mathcal{S}$. For each i, let k_i be least such that $\Lambda'(i) \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda(k_i))$. Let $k = \min_i k_i$ and choose i least such that $k_i = k$. Define

$$\Lambda^*(j) = \begin{cases} \Lambda(j) & \text{if } j < k \\ \Lambda'(j - k + i) & \text{if } k \leq j \end{cases}$$

Since $\Lambda^* \upharpoonright k = \Lambda \upharpoonright k$ and $\Lambda^*(k) = \Lambda'(i) \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda(k))$, we have $\Lambda^* \not\preceq \Lambda$. To see that Λ^* is bad, let $j < j'$ be given; if $j' < k$ then $\Lambda^*(j) = \Lambda(j) \not\preceq \Lambda(j') = \Lambda^*(j')$ and if $k \leq j$ then $\Lambda^*(j) = \Lambda'(j - k + 1) \not\preceq \Lambda'(j' - k + 1) = \Lambda^*(j')$. If $j < k \leq j'$ then $\Lambda^*(j) = \Lambda(j) \not\preceq \Lambda(k_{j'-k+1})$ and since $\Lambda^*(j') = \Lambda'(j' - k + 1) \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda(k_{j'-k+1}))$, we must have $\Lambda^*(j) \not\preceq \Lambda^*(j')$.

But then Λ^* is an infinite path to the left of Λ, contradicting the choice of Λ.

To see that the proof goes through in $\mathbf{\Sigma}_2$-$\mathbf{LPP_0}$, we need only observe that we applied Higman's Theorem to a path given by Ramsey's Theorem for Pairs, and since we may choose the path given by Ramsey's Theorem is low_2 in Λ (see [4]), it follows that Λ^* can be chosen Σ_2 in Λ. □

A complete analysis of the proof-theoretic strength of Kruskal's Theorem was given by Rathjen and Weierman [10]; $\mathbf{\Sigma}_2$-$\mathbf{LPP_0}$ is close to (but not exactly) tight, at least with respect to proof-theoretic strength.

6. THE ARITHMETIC RELATIVE MINIMAL PATH PRINCIPLE

In this section we prove the following:

Theorem 6.1. *For every $n > 0$, $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{n+1}(\mathbf{\Pi^1_1})$-$\mathbf{TI_0}$ proves $\mathbf{\Sigma}_n$-$\mathbf{MPP_0}$.*

Throughout this section, fix a tree of sequences T and a well-ordering $\prec$. We write T_σ for $\{\tau \in T \mid \sigma \sqsubseteq \tau\}$.

All definitions in this section are assumed to be given in $\mathbf{ACA_0}$.

Definition 6.2. *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be the language of first-order arithmetic, including a pairing function $(\cdot, \cdot)$ and the corresponding projections p_1, p_2, with a new function symbol F and a new predicate symbol $\hat{T}$. We define the* rank n formulas *and the* basic rank n formulas *inductively by:*

- *$F(i) = j$ where i, j are terms is a basic rank 0 formula,*
- *All other atomic formulas are (non-basic) rank 0 formulas,*
- *If ϕ is a rank n formula then $\exists x \phi$ and $\forall x \phi$ are basic rank $n + 1$ formula,*
- *The rank n formulas contain the basic rank n formulas and are closed under $\wedge, \vee, \neg, \rightarrow$.*

We write $\mathcal{F}_n$ for the collection of basic formulas of rank n and write $rk(\phi)$ for the least n such that ϕ is a formula of rank n.

When s is a set of $\mathcal{L}$-formulas, we define $\hat{s} = s \cup \{\hat{T}(n) \mid n \in T\} \cup \{\neg\hat{T}(n) \mid n \notin T\}$. We take $\vdash$ to be the usual deduction relation for first-order logic.

Definition 6.3. *For each n, define $\mathcal{T}_n(T)$ to consist of those finite sets s of $\mathcal{L}$-formulas such that:*

- *If $\phi \in s$ then ϕ is a closed basic formula of rank $\leq n$,*
- *$\hat{s}$ is consistent,*
- *If $F(i) = k \in s$ and $i' < i$ then there is a j' such that $F(i') = j' \in s$,*
- *If $F(i) = j \in s$ then the sequence $\langle F(0), \dots, F(i)\rangle \in T$,*
- *If $\exists x\phi(x) \in s$ then there is some i such that $\hat{s} \cap \mathcal{F}_{rk(\phi)} \vdash \phi(i)$.*

We say s decides *$F(i) = j$ if there is some j' such that $F(i) = j' \in s$; we say s decides $\exists x\phi$ if either $\exists x\phi \in s$ or $\forall x\neg\phi \in s$.*

If i is largest such that for some j, $F(i) = j \in s$, we write σ_s for $\langle F(0), \dots, F(i)\rangle$.

If $m \leq n$, define $\pi^n_m : \mathcal{T}_n(T) \to \mathcal{T}_m(T)$ by $\pi^n_m(s) = \{\phi \in s \mid rk(\phi) \leq m\}$.

If $m < n$, $t \in \mathcal{T}_m(T)$, $s \in \mathcal{T}_n(T)$, we write $t \prec^{+1} s$ if there is a formula $\forall x\phi \in s$ with $rk(\phi) = n$ such that $\hat{t} \vdash \exists x\neg\phi$.

Note that the construction of $\mathcal{T}_n(T)$ requires arithmetic comprehension. (We could probably, at significant additional labor, reduce this to computable comprehension, since we are really only concerned with fairly direct proofs.)

Lemma 6.4 ($\mathbf{ACA_0}$). *If $s \in \mathcal{T}_{n+1}(T)$, $t \in \mathcal{T}_n$, $t \supseteq \pi^{n+1}_n(s)$ and $t \not\prec^{+1} s$ then $t \cup s \in \mathcal{T}_{n+1}(T)$.*

Proof. We need only check that $t \cup s$ is consistent. Suppose not. Since t is consistent, $\hat{t} \vdash \neg\phi$ for some $\phi \in s$ of rank $n+1$. It cannot be that ϕ is universal, since then we would have $t \prec^{+1} s$, so ϕ must be existential. But if ϕ is existential then $\pi^{n+1}_n(s) \vdash \phi$, and since t is consistent and extends $\pi^{n+1}_n(s)$, we cannot have $\hat{t} \vdash \neg\phi$. ☐

Definition 6.5. *For each n, we define collections $WF'_n \subseteq \mathcal{T}_\beta(T)$ and $WF_n \subseteq \mathcal{T}_\beta(T)$ inductively as follows.*

- *$WF'_0(t)$ holds if:*
  Suppose that for every $\tau \prec \sigma_t$, T_τ is well-founded. Then T_{σ_t} is well-founded.
- *$WF'_{n+1}(t)$ holds if:*
  Suppose that for all $s \supseteq \pi^{n+1}_n(t)$ such that $s \prec^{+1} t$, $WF_n(s)$; then for all $s \supseteq \pi^{n+1}_n(t)$, $WF_n(s)$.
- *$WF_n(t)$ holds if for every $s \supseteq t$ in $\mathcal{T}_n$, $WF'_n(s)$.*

We have stated WF'_0 and WF_0 to emphasize the similarity with WF'_n and WF_n, however $WF'_0(t)$ actually immediately implies $WF_0(t)$: if $WF'_0(t)$ holds, $s \supseteq t$, and for every $\tau \prec \sigma_s$, T_τ is well-founded, then also for every $\tau \prec \sigma_t$, T_τ is well-founded, and therefore T_{σ_t} is well-founded, which implies that T_{σ_s} is well-founded. This means that WF_0 is (equivalent to) a $\Sigma_0(\Pi^1_1)$ formula, and so for each n, WF_n is (equivalent to) a $\Sigma_n(\Pi^1_1)$ formula.

Lemma 6.6 ($\mathbf{ACA_0}$). *If $WF_n(s)$ and $s \subseteq t$ then $WF_n(t)$.*

Proof. Immediate, since the definition is monotonic. ☐

Lemma 6.7 ($\mathbf{ACA_0}$). *If $WF_n(\pi^{n+1}_n(t))$ then $WF_{n+1}(t)$.*

Proof. Assuming $WF_n(\pi^{n+1}_n(t))$, for every $s \supseteq \pi^{n+1}_n(t)$, $WF_n(s)$. This implies $WF_{n+1}(t)$. ☐

Lemma 6.8 ($\mathbf{\Sigma}_0(\mathbf{\Pi^1_1})$**-**$\mathbf{TI_0}$**).** *Let ϕ be a basic rank 0 formula, let $s \in \mathcal{T}_0(T)$, and suppose that for every $t \subseteq s$ such that t decides ϕ, $WF_0(t)$. Then $WF_0(s)$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume ϕ is $F(i) = 0$. By main induction on r, we show that

> Whenever $t \supseteq s$ with $|\sigma_t| = i + 1 - r$, $WF_0(t)$.

If $r = 0$, t decides $F(i) = 0$, and therefore by assumption, $WF_0(t)$.

Suppose the claim holds for r and let $t \supseteq s$ be given with $|\sigma_t| = i+1-(r+1) = i-r$. If there is a $\tau \prec \sigma_t$ such that T_τ is ill-founded then we immediately have $WF_0(t)$. Otherwise, for each k, let $t_k = t \cup \{F(|\sigma_t|) = k\}$. By side induction on k along $\prec$, we will show that $T_{\sigma_{t_k}}$ is well-founded. Suppose that for all $k' \prec k$ with $t_{k'} \in \mathcal{T}_0(T)$, $\sigma_{t_{k'}}$ is well-founded. Since $|\sigma_{t_k}| = |\sigma_t| + 1 = i + 1 - r$, we have $WF_0(t_k)$. If $\tau \prec \sigma_{t_k}$ and $\tau \in T$, we either have $\tau \prec \sigma_t$, in which case we have assumed T_τ is well-founded, or $\tau = \sigma_t^\frown\langle k'\rangle = \sigma_{t_{k'}}$ for some $k' \prec k$, in which case we have that T_τ is well-founed by side IH. Therefore $T_{\sigma_{t_k}}$ is well-founded. Since $T_{\sigma_{t_k}} = T_{\sigma_t^\frown\langle k\rangle}$ is well-founded whenever $\sigma_t^\frown\langle k\rangle \in T$, it follows that σ_t is well-founded, as desired.

Since $|\sigma_s| = i + 1 - r$ for some r, the statement holds in particular for s. $\square$

Lemma 6.9 ($\mathbf{ACA_0}$)**.** *Let ϕ be a basic rank $n+1$ formula, let $s \in \mathcal{T}_{n+1}(T)$, and suppose that for every $t \supseteq s$ such that t decides ϕ, $WF_{n+1}(t)$. Then $WF_{n+1}(s)$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume ϕ is the formula $\exists x\psi$. It suffices to show that whenever the assumption holds of s, $WF'_{n+1}(s)$. If s decides ϕ we have $WF_{n+1}(s)$ by assumption, so assume s does not decide ϕ. Assume s satisfies the premise of $WF'_{n+1}(s)$: whenever $t \supseteq \pi^{n+1}_n(s)$ and $t \prec^{+1} s$, $WF_n(t)$.

First, consider any $s_+ \supseteq s$ such that $(s_+ \setminus s) \cap \mathcal{F}_{n+1} = \{\phi\}$, so s_+ decides ϕ. Suppose $t \supseteq \pi^{n+1}_n(s_+)$ and $t \prec^{+1} s_+$. Then there is a formula $\forall x\psi' \in s_+$ and a k such that $\hat{t} \vdash \neg\psi'(k)$. We must have $\forall x\psi' \in s$ and therefore $t \prec^{+1} s$, so $WF_n(t)$. Since $WF_{n+1}(s_+)$ holds, it follows that whenever $t \supseteq \pi^{n+1}_n(s_+)$, $WF_n(t)$.

Now let $s_- = s \cup \{\forall x\neg\psi\}$ and suppose $t \supseteq \pi^{n+1}_n(s_-)$ and $t \prec^{+1} s_-$. As before, there is a formula $\forall x\psi' \in s_-$ and a k such that $t \vdash \psi'(k)$. If $\psi' \neq \neg\psi$, again we have $WF_n(t)$ since $t \prec^{+1} s$. Otherwise, set $s_+ = t \cup s \cup \{\phi\}$; then $\pi^{n+1}_n(s_+) = t$, and therefore $WF_n(t)$ by the preceding paragraph. So for any $t \supseteq \pi^{n+1}_n(s_-)$ with $t \prec^{+1} s_-$, $WF_n(t)$. Since s_- decides ϕ, we have $WF_{n+1}(s_-)$, and therefore for all $t \supseteq \pi^{n+1}_n(s_-)$, $WF_n(t)$. Since $\pi^{n+1}_n(s_-) = \pi^{n+1}_n(s)$, it follows that whenever $t \supseteq \pi^{n+1}_n(s)$, $WF_n(t)$, and therefore $WF'_{n+1}(s)$. $\square$

Lemma 6.10 ($\mathbf{ACA_0}$)**.** *Let ϕ be a basic rank m formula, let $n \geq m$, and suppose that:*

> *Whenever $s \in \mathcal{T}_n(T)$ and for every $t \supseteq s$ such that t decides ϕ, $WF_n(t)$, then $WF_n(s)$.*

Then:

> *Whenever $s \in \mathcal{T}_{n+1}(T)$ and for every $t \supseteq s$ such that t decides ϕ, $WF_{n+1}(t)$, then $WF_{n+1}(s)$.*

Proof. Let $s \in \mathcal{T}_{n+1}(T)$ be given, and suppose that for every $t \supseteq s$ such that t decides ϕ, $WF_{n+1}(t)$. Again, it suffices to show that $WF'_{n+1}(s)$. Suppose that whenever $t \supseteq \pi^{n+1}_n(s)$ and $t \prec^{+1} s$, $WF_n(t)$. Let $t \supseteq \pi^{n+1}_n(s)$ be arbitrary; we will show $WF_n(t)$. To do this, it suffices to show that whenever $t' \supseteq t$ decides ϕ, $WF_n(t')$.

So suppose $t' \supseteq t$ is given such that t' decides ϕ. If $t' \prec^{+1} s$ then $WF_n(t')$ by assumption. Otherwise, set $s' = t' \cup s$. Since s' decides ϕ, $WF_{n+1}(s')$ holds. Whenever

$t'' \supseteq \pi^{n+1}_n(s') = t'$ with $t'' \prec^{+1} s'$, also $t'' \prec^{+1} s$, and therefore $WF_n(t'')$. Therefore for any $t'' \supseteq \pi^{n+1}_n(s') = t'$, $WF_n(t'')$, and in particular $WF_n(t')$.

□

Lemma 6.11 ($\mathbf{ACA_0}$). *If $WF_{n+1}(\emptyset)$ then $WF_n(\emptyset)$.*

Proof. If $WF_{n+1}(\emptyset)$ then, in particular, $WF'_{n+1}(\emptyset)$. If $t \supseteq \pi^{n+1}_n(\emptyset)$ then we cannot have $t \prec^{+1} \emptyset$, so the premise of $WF'_{n+1}(\emptyset)$ is trivially satisfied, and therefore whenever $t \in \mathcal{T}_n(T)$, $t \supseteq \pi^{n+1}_n(\emptyset) = \emptyset$, so $WF_n(t)$. In particular, $WF_n(\emptyset)$. □

Definition 6.12. *Given $s \in \mathcal{T}_n(T)$ and a formula $\phi(x, y)$ with only the displayed free variables, we define a sequence $\sigma_{s,\phi}$ recursively: $\emptyset \subseteq \sigma_{s,\phi}$, and if $\tau \sqsubseteq \sigma_{s,\phi}$ and there is exactly one i such that $\hat{s} \vdash \phi(|\tau|, i)$ then $\tau^\frown\langle i\rangle \sqsubseteq \sigma_{s,\phi}$.*

Definition 6.13. *Let n be a successor. We define $\widehat{\mathcal{T}_n(T)}$ to consist of pairs (s, U) such that:*

- *$s \in \mathcal{T}_n(T)$*
- *U is a partial functions whose domain is a finite set of basic formulas of rank $\leq n$ of the form $\exists z\phi(x, y, z)$ with only the displayed free variables, and whose range is $\{0, 1\}$*
- *If $U(\phi)$ is defined then $U(\phi) = 1$ iff one of the following* excluding conditions *holds:*
  - *There are m, i, j with $i \neq j$ such that $\exists z\phi(m, i, z) \in s$ and $\exists z\phi(m, j, z) \in s$,*
  - *There is an m such that $\forall u\neg\phi(m, p_1(u), p_2(u)) \in s$, or*
  - *$\sigma_{s,\phi} \notin T$.*

We say (s, U) decides *$U(\phi)$ if $U(\phi)$ is defined.*

We define $\hat{\pi} : \widehat{\mathcal{T}_n(T)} \to \mathcal{T}_n(T)$ by $\hat{\pi}(s, U) = s$.

If $t \in \mathcal{T}_n(T)$ and $(s, U) \in \widehat{\mathcal{T}_n(T)}$, we say $t \prec^{+1} (s, U)$ if there is a ϕ such that $U(\phi) = 0$ but t satisfies one of the excluding conditions for ϕ.

$\widehat{WF}'_n(s, U)$ holds if

> *Suppose that for all $t \supseteq t$ such that $t \prec^{+1} (s, U)$, $WF_n(t)$; then for all $t \supseteq \hat{\pi}(s, U)$, $WF_n(t)$.*

$\widehat{WF}_n(t, V)$ holds if for all $(s, U) \supseteq (t, V)$, $\widehat{WF}'_n(s, U)$ holds.

As above, we have

Lemma 6.14 ($\mathbf{ACA_0}$). *If n is a successor,*

1. *If $\widehat{WF}_n(t, V)$ holds and $(s, U) \supseteq (t, V)$ then $\widehat{WF}_n(s, U)$ holds.*
2. *If $WF_n(s)$ holds then $\widehat{WF}_n(s, U)$ holds.*
3. *If $\widehat{WF}_n(\emptyset, \emptyset)$ then $WF_n(\emptyset)$.*

Lemma 6.15 ($\mathbf{ACA_0}$). *Let n be a successor. Let ϕ be a formula and suppose that whenever $(t, V) \supseteq (s, U)$ and (t, V) decides $U(\phi)$, $\widehat{WF}_n(t, V)$. Then $\widehat{WF}_n(s, U)$.*

Proof. It suffices to show that $\widehat{WF}'_n(s, U)$. Suppose the premise of $\widehat{WF}'_n(s, U)$ holds, so that whenever $s' \supseteq s$ and $s' \prec^{+1} (s, U)$, $WF_n(s')$.

First, if s satisfies one of the excluding conditions for ϕ then $(s, U \cup \{(\phi, 1)\}) \in \widehat{\mathcal{T}_n(T)}$, and therefore $\widehat{WF}_n(s, U \cup \{(\phi, 1)\})$. Since $\hat{\pi}(s, U \cup \{(\phi, 1)\}) = \hat{\pi}(s, U)$, we have $\widehat{WF}_n(s, U)$.

Otherwise, let (t, V) extend (s, U) such that $V(\phi) = 1$ and $\mathrm{dom}(V) \setminus \mathrm{dom}(U) = \{\phi\}$, and let $t' \supseteq t$ with $t' \prec^{+1} (t, V)$. Then there is a ψ such that t' satisfies one of the excluding conditions for ψ but $V(\psi) = 0$. Therefore $U(\psi) = 0$ as well, so $t' \prec^{+1} (s, U)$, and therefore $WF_n(t')$. Since $\widehat{WF}_n(t, V)$ holds, it follows that for all $t' \supseteq \hat{\pi}(t, V)$, we have $WF_n(t')$.

Now set $V = U \cup \{(\phi, 0)\}$, so (s, V) decides ϕ, and let $t \supseteq s$ with $t \prec^{+1} (s, V)$. Then there is a ψ such that t satisfies one of the excluding conditions for ψ but $V(\psi) = 0$. If $\psi \neq \phi$ then $t \prec^{+1} (s, U)$, and therefore $WF_n(t)$. If $\psi = \phi$ then $(t, U \cup \{(\phi, 1)\})$ also decides ϕ, and so we have shown in previous paragraph that again $WF_n(t)$. Since $\widehat{WF}_n(s, V)$, it follows that whenever $t \supseteq s$, $WF_n(s)$, as desired. □

Lemma 6.16 ($\mathbf{ACA_0}$). *Let ϕ be a formula and suppose that whenever $s \in \mathcal{T}_n$ and for every $t \supseteq s$ such that t decides ϕ, $WF_n(t)$, then $WF_n(s)$. Then whenever $(s, U) \in \widehat{\mathcal{T}_n(T)}$ is such that for every $(t, V) \supseteq (s, U)$ such that (t, V) decides ϕ, $\widehat{WF}_n(t, V)$, then $\widehat{WF}_n(s, U)$.*

Proof. Our proof is similar to that of Lemma 6.10. It will suffice to show $\widehat{WF}'_n(s, U)$. Suppose the premise of $\widehat{WF}'_n(s, U)$ holds, so whenever $t \supseteq s$ and $t \prec^{+1} s$, $WF_n(t)$.

Let $t \supseteq s$ be given. By assumption, it suffices to show that whenever $t' \supseteq t$ and t' decides ϕ, $WF_n(t')$. So let some $t' \supseteq t$ be given such that t' decides ϕ. If $t' \prec^{+1} (s, U)$ then $WF_n(t')$. Otherwise $(t', U) \supseteq (s, U)$ and decides ϕ, so $\widehat{WF}_n(t', U)$. Moreover, whenever $t'' \supseteq t'$ and $t'' \prec^{+1} (t', U)$, $t'' \prec^{+1} (s, U)$, and therefore $WF_n(t'')$. So we have $WF_n(t')$, as desired. □

By a *decision of rank* n, we mean either a formula ϕ of rank n, or $U(\phi)$ where ϕ is a basic formula of rank $\leq n$ in the form $\exists z \phi(x, y, z)$ with only the displayed free variables.

Lemma 6.17 ($\mathbf{\Sigma}_m(\mathbf{\Pi^1_1})$-$\mathbf{TI_0}$). *Let m be a successor. Let $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \widehat{\mathcal{T}_n(T)}$, and suppose that there is no path through $\mathcal{S}$ deciding every decision of rank n. Let A be a formula in $\Sigma_m(\Pi^1_1)$ and suppose the following principle holds:*

> *If for any $(s, U) \in \mathcal{S}$ and any decision ϕ such that whenever $(t, V) \supseteq (s, U)$, $(t, V) \in \mathcal{S}$, and (t, V) decides ϕ, $A(t, V)$, then $A(s, U)$.*

Then for every $(s, U) \in \mathcal{S}$, $A(s, U)$.

Proof. Fix a surjective function ρ from $\mathbb{N}$ to the set of decisions, and consider the tree $\mathcal{S}'$ of increasing sequences σ from $\mathcal{S}$ such that for each i, if $\rho(i)$ is a decision of rank $\leq n$ then $\sigma(i)$ decides $\rho(i)$. Clearly any infinite path through $\mathcal{S}'$ is an infinite path through $\mathcal{S}$ deciding all formulas, so $\mathcal{S}'$ is well-founded.

Let $A'(\sigma)$ hold if $A(\sigma(|\sigma| - 1))$ holds, so A' is a $\Sigma_m(\Pi^1_1)$ formula. We claim A' is progressive: let σ be given with (s, U) its final element, and suppose that for all (t, V) such that $\sigma^\frown\langle(t, V)\rangle \in \mathcal{S}'$, $A'(\sigma^\frown\langle(t, V)\rangle)$. Then whenever $(t, V) \supseteq (s, U)$ and (t, V) decides $\rho(|\sigma|)$, $A'(\sigma^\frown\langle(t, V)\rangle)$, and therefore $A(t, V)$. Therefore $A(s, U)$, and so $A'(\sigma)$.

So by transfinite induction on $\mathcal{S}'$, A' holds of all σ, and in particular, $A(s, U)$ for all $(s, U) \in \mathcal{S}$. □

Definition 6.18.

$$\widehat{\mathcal{T}_n(T)}^+ = \{(s, U) \in \widehat{\mathcal{T}_n(T)} \mid U(\phi) = 1 \textit{ whenever } U(\phi) \textit{ is defined}\}.$$

Theorem 6.19 ($\mathbf{\Sigma}_{n+1}(\mathbf{\Pi^1_1})$-$\mathbf{TI_0}$). *Let n be a successor. Suppose that:*

- *Whenever $WF_0(\pi^n_0(s))$, $\widehat{WF}_n(s, U)$,*

- *If* $\widehat{WF}_n(\emptyset,\emptyset)$ *then* $WF_0(\emptyset)$*,*
- *There is no infinite path through* $\widehat{\mathcal{T}_n(T)}^+$ *deciding every decision.*

Then T *is well-founded.*

Proof. We first show that $\widehat{WF}_n(s,U)$ holds for all $(s,U)\in\widehat{\mathcal{T}_n(T)}\setminus\widehat{\mathcal{T}_n(T)}^+$. Let (s,U) be given with $U(\phi)=0$ for some ϕ. If $T_{\sigma_{s,\phi}}$ is ill-founded then $\sigma_{s,\phi}\prec\sigma_s$ witnesses $WF_0(\pi^n_0(s))$, and therefore $\widehat{WF}_n(s,U)$. Otherwise, for each $\tau\in T_{\sigma_{s,\phi}}$, let

$$\mathcal{S}_\tau=\{(t,V)\supseteq(s,U)\mid\sigma_{t,\phi}=\tau\}.$$

We proceed by induction on $\tau\in T_{\sigma_{s,\phi}}$ showing that for every $(t,V)\in\mathcal{S}_\tau$, $\widehat{WF}_n(t,V)$.

Let $(t,V)\in\mathcal{S}_\tau$ be given and suppose that for every k such that $\sigma_{t,\phi}{}^\frown\langle k\rangle\in T$ and every $(t',V')\supseteq(s,U)$ with $\sigma_{t',\phi}=\sigma_{t,\phi}{}^\frown\langle k\rangle$, $\widehat{WF}_n(t',V')$. Let (t',V') be any extension of (t,V) deciding $\exists k\phi(|\sigma_t|,k)$ (note that, pairing variables and using the fact that n is a successor, this has the same rank as ϕ). Then since $V'(\phi)=V(\phi)=U(\phi)=0$, it must be that there is such a k, and therefore $t'\vdash\phi(|\sigma_t|,k)$ for some k and $\sigma_{t',\phi}\in T$, so $\widehat{WF}_n(t',V')$. So $\widehat{WF}_n(t',V')$ holds for any $(t',V')\supseteq(t,V)$ deciding $\exists k\phi(|\sigma_t|,k)$, and therefore $\widehat{WF}_n(t,V)$ holds.

By induction, for any $\tau\in T_{\sigma_{s,\phi}}$, any $(t,V)\in\mathcal{S}_\tau$ satisfies $\widehat{WF}_n(t,V)$. In particular, $\widehat{WF}_n(s,U)$.

Now we show that $\widehat{WF}_n(s,U)$ holds for $\widehat{\mathcal{T}_n(T)}^+$ using the modified induction given by the previous lemma. Suppose that $(s,U)\in\widehat{\mathcal{T}_n(T)}^+$ and ψ is a decision such that whenever $(t,V)\supseteq(s,U)$, $(t,V)\in\widehat{\mathcal{T}_n(T)}^+$, and (t,V) decides ψ, $\widehat{WF}_n(t,V)$. Then for any $(t,V)\supseteq(S,U)$ deciding ψ, either $(t,V)\in\widehat{\mathcal{T}_n(T)}^+$, in which case $\widehat{WF}_n(t,V)$ by assumption, or $(t,V)\notin\widehat{\mathcal{T}_n(T)}^+$, in which case we have just shown that $\widehat{WF}_n(t,V)$. Therefore, by the previous lemma, for every $(s,U)\in\widehat{\mathcal{T}_n(T)}^+$, $\widehat{WF}_n(s,U)$.

It follows in particular that $\widehat{WF}_n(\emptyset,\emptyset)$, and therefore $WF_0(\emptyset)$. Since there are no $\sigma\in T$ with $\sigma\prec\emptyset$, it follows that $T_\emptyset=T$ is well-founded. ☐

Definition 6.20. *Let* ϕ *be a closed formula of* $\mathcal{L}$*. Then* $\hat{\phi}(X,Y)$ *is the formula of second-order arithmetic which interprets the function symbol* F *by* X *and the predicate symbol* $\hat{T}$ *by* Y*.*

Lemma 6.21 ($\mathbf{ACA_0}$). *Let* Λ *be a path through* $\mathcal{T}_n(T)$ *deciding all formulas of rank* $\leq n$ *and let* σ_Λ *be the corresponding sequence through* T *given by* $\sigma_\Lambda(i)=j$ *iff* $F(i)=j\in\Lambda(m)$ *for some (and therefore cofinitely many)* m*.*

Then whenever ϕ *is a closed formula of rank* $\leq n$*, the following are equivalent:*

1. *There is an* m *such that* $\Lambda(m)\vdash\phi$*,*
2. $\hat{\phi}(\sigma_\Lambda,T)$*.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on formulas. When ϕ is atomic, the equivalence follows immediately from the definitions.

Suppose the claim holds for ϕ and ψ. The claim for $\neg\phi$ follows from the equivalence for ϕ and the fact that Λ decides all formulas of rank $\leq n$, including $\neg\phi$. Similarly for other propositional combinations of ϕ and ψ.

Suppose that for every k, the claim holds for $\phi(k)$. If $\exists x\phi\in\Lambda(m)$ then there is some k such that $\Lambda(m)\vdash\phi(k)$, and by IH, $\hat{\phi}(k)(\sigma_\Lambda,T)$, and therefore $\widehat{\exists x\phi}(\sigma_\Lambda,T)$. If $\forall x\phi\in$

$\Lambda(m)$ then there are no m', k such that $\Lambda(m') \vdash \neg\phi(k)$, and therefore $\widehat{\neg\phi(k)}(\sigma_\Lambda, T)$ never holds, so $\widehat{\forall x\phi}(\sigma_\Lambda, T)$ holds. The other direction follows since either $\widehat{\exists x\phi}(\sigma_\Lambda, T)$ or $\widehat{\forall x\neg\phi}(\sigma_\Lambda, T)$ must hold, and there is some m such that either $\exists x\phi \in \Lambda(m)$ or $\forall x\neg\phi \in \Lambda(m)$. ☐

Theorem 6.22. *For any finite* $n > 0$, $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{n+1}(\mathbf{\Pi^1_1})$-$\mathbf{TI_0}$ *implies* $\mathbf{\Sigma}_n$-$\mathbf{MPP_0}$.

Proof. Let T be a tree of finite sequences and let $\prec$ be a well-founded partial order. Suppose that for every path Λ through T, there is a Λ' which is Σ_n in $T \oplus \Lambda$ with $\Lambda' \prec \Lambda$.

Suppose there were an infinite path Λ through $\widehat{\mathcal{T}_n(T)}^{+}$ deciding every decision of rank $\leq n$. For each i, there is a unique $\sigma_\Lambda(i)$ such that $F(i) = \sigma_\Lambda(i) \in \hat{\pi}(\Lambda(j))$ for some j (and therefore cofinitely many j). The function σ_Λ must be a path through T. Suppose $\Lambda' \prec \sigma_\Lambda$ and there is a Σ_n formula ϕ such that $\exists z\phi(i, j, z, T, \sigma_\Lambda)$ iff $\Lambda'(i) = j$. By the previous lemma, we have $\exists z\phi(i, j, z) \in \Lambda(m)$ for some m iff $\Lambda'(i) = j$. Since Λ' is a path through T, none of the excluding conditions for ϕ can ever hold, so whenever $\Lambda(j) = (s, U)$ and $U(\phi)$ is defined, $U(\phi) = 0$. But this would contradict the fact that Λ is a path through $\widehat{\mathcal{T}_n(T)}^{+}$. So there is no infinite path Λ through $\widehat{\mathcal{T}_n(T)}^{+}$ deciding every decision.

Observe that the first two conditions in Theorem 6.19 all hold in $\mathbf{\Sigma}_n(\mathbf{\Pi^1_1})$-$\mathbf{TI_0}$ (since n is finite), so we obtain the conclusion that T is well-founded. ☐

7. THE NASH-WILLIAMS THEOREM AND MENGER'S THEOREM

7.1. **The Nash-Williams Theorem.** In what follows, we will use the letter b (and variants b' and so on) to represent finite sequences which are intended to be increasing (and specifically, members of a barrier).

Definition 7.1. *A sequence* b *is* increasing *if whenever* $i < j$, $b(i) < b(j)$.

Let B *be a set of finite increasing sequences. We write* $base(B)$ *for the set of* n *such that for some* $b \in B$ *and some* $i \in \mathrm{dom}(b)$, $b(i) = n$.

A barrier *is a set* B *of finite increasing sequences such that:*

- $base(B)$ *is infinite,*
- *If* Λ *is an infinite increasing sequence from* $base(B)$*, there is a* $b \in B$ *such that* $b \sqsubset \Lambda$,
- *If* $b, b' \in B$ *and* $b \neq b'$ *then* $\mathrm{rng}(b) \not\subseteq \mathrm{rng}(b')$

If b *is a sequence, we write* b^- *for the sequence given by* $b^-(i) = b(i+1)$ *(and* $b^-(i)$ *is undefined if* $b(i+1)$ *is).*

If b, b' *are sequences, we write* $b \lhd b'$ *if there is a* b^* *such that* $b \sqsubseteq b^*$ *and* $b' \sqsubseteq ((b^*)^-$.

If B *is a barrier,* $B' \subseteq B$ *(where* B' *is finite or infinite), and* $f : B' \to Q$, f *is* good *if for some* $b, b' \in B'$ *with* $b \lhd b'$, $f(b) \preceq_Q f(b')$. *If* f *is not good,* f *is* bad. *If for every* $b, b' \in B'$ *with* $b \lhd b'$, $f(b) \preceq_Q f(b')$ *then* f *is* perfect.

If B *is a barrier,* Q *is a* B-better-quasi-order *(*B*-bqo) if for every barrier* $B' \subseteq B$ *and every* $f : B' \to Q$, f *is good.* Q *is a* better-quasi-order *(bqo) if for every barrier* B, Q *is a* B*-bqo.*

B is a barrier iff $\{b \mid \forall b' \in B\ b' \not\sqsubseteq b\}$ is well-founded as a tree of sequences from $base(B)$.

Definition 7.2. *Given* Q, $\tilde{Q}$ *is the class of all pairs* (α, f) *where* α *is a well-order and* $f : \alpha \to Q$. *If* $(\alpha, f), (\beta, g) \in \tilde{Q}$, *we say* $(\alpha, f) \tilde{\preceq}_Q (\beta, g)$ *if there is a strictly increasing function* $\pi : \alpha \to \beta$ *such that for all* $\gamma \in \alpha$, $f(\gamma) \preceq_Q g(\pi(\gamma))$.

$\mathbf{NWT}$, *the Nash-Williams Theorem, is the statement that for if* Q *is a bqo then* $\tilde{Q}$ *is bqo.*[‡]

$\mathbf{GHT}$, *the Generalized Higman's Theorem, is the statement that if* Q *is a* B*-bqo then* $Q^{<\omega}$ *is a* B*-bqo.*[§]

Marcone [8] has shown:

Theorem 7.3. (1) *In* $\mathbf{ATR_0}$, $\mathbf{NWT}$ *is equivalent to* $\mathbf{GHT}$.
(2) $\mathbf{\Pi^1_1}$-$\mathbf{CA_0}$ *implies* $\mathbf{GHT}$.

Since $\mathbf{GHT}$ is a Π^1_2 sentence, it is not possible for $\mathbf{GHT}$ be equivalent to $\mathbf{\Pi^1_1}$-$\mathbf{CA_0}$. We will now show that Marcone's proof goes through essentially unchanged in $\mathbf{TMPP_0}$.[¶]

Definition 7.4. *If* B *is a barrier and* $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$*, we write* $B \upharpoonright X$ *for* $\{b \in B \mid \operatorname{rng}(b) \subseteq X\}$.

Lemma 7.5 ($\mathbf{RCA_0}$)**.** *If* X *is an infinite subset of* $base(B)$ *then* $B \upharpoonright X$ *is a barrier.*

Proof. Clearly $base(B \upharpoonright X) \subseteq X$. Suppose Λ is an infinite increasing sequence from X. Then since $X \subseteq base(B)$, there is a $b \in B$ such that $b \sqsubset \Lambda$, and therefore $b \in B \upharpoonright X$. Therefore $base(B \upharpoonright X) = X$ and every infinite sequence through X has an initial segment in $B \upharpoonright X$. The other two conditions are immediate since $B \upharpoonright X \subseteq B$. ☐

Lemma 7.6 ($\mathbf{RCA_0}$)**.** *If* $B' \subseteq B$ *is a barrier then* $B' = B \upharpoonright base(B')$.

Proof. Suppose $b \in B \upharpoonright base(B')$. Let Λ be an infinite increasing sequence from $base(B')$ such that $b \sqsubset \Lambda$. Then there is a $b' \in B' \subseteq B$ such that $b' \sqsubset \Lambda$. If $b' \neq b$ then we have either $\operatorname{rng}(b) \subseteq \operatorname{rng}(b')$ or $\operatorname{rng}(b') \subseteq \operatorname{rng}(b)$, contradicting the fact that B is a barrier. ☐

Definition 7.7. *A sequence* σ *from* $B \times Q$, $\sigma = \langle (b_0, q_0), \dots, (b_k, q_k) \rangle$ *is a* bad partial array *if:*

- *When* $i < j$, $\max b_i \leq \max b_j$,
- *If* $b_i \lhd b_j$, $q_i \not\leq_Q q_j$,
- *If* $b \in B \upharpoonright base(\{b_0, \dots, b_k\})$ *and* $\max b < \max b_k$ *then there is an* $i < k$ *such that* $b = b_i$.

If σ *is a bad partial array, we define a partial function* $f^\sigma : B \to Q$ *by setting* $f^\sigma(b) = q$ *iff there is an* i *such that* $\sigma(i) = (b, q)$*. If* Λ *is an infinite path through the tree of bad partial arrays, we define* f^Λ *similarly.*

Lemma 7.8 ($\mathbf{RCA_0}$)**.** f *is a bad function from a barrier* $B' \subseteq B$ *to* Q *iff there is an infinite path* Λ *through the tree of bad partial arrays such that* $f = f^\Lambda$.

Proof. Suppose $B' \subseteq B$ is a barrier and $f : B' \to Q$ is bad. Fix an enumeration of B', $B' = \{b_0, b_1, \dots\}$ such that if $i < j$ then $\max b_i \leq \max b_j$. Define $\Lambda(i) = (b_i, f(b_i))$. Clearly $f = f^\Lambda$. We must check that if $\sigma \sqsubset \Lambda$ then σ is a bad partial array; the first two conditions are immediate from the enumeration of B' and the fact that f is bad. If $b \in B \upharpoonright base(\{b_0, \dots, b_k\})$ and $\max b < \max b_k$ then $b \in B \upharpoonright base(B') = B'$, so there is an $i < k$ such that $b = b_i$.

[‡] Note that even though $\tilde{Q}$ is not a set, we can still formulate the statement that $\tilde{Q}$ is bqo in second order arithmetic.

[§] Our statement of $\mathbf{GHT}$ differs slightly from Marcone's: Marcone takes $\mathbf{GHT}$ to be the statement that if Q is a B-bqo for all barriers B then $Q^{<\omega}$ is a B-bqo for all barriers B, which is a Π^1_3 statement, and mentions this version of $\mathbf{GHT}$ as an intermediate step.

[¶] Marcone's proof uses the "locally minimal bad array lemma", which is a principle similar, and equivalent, to the minimal path principle. This lemma is essentially an encapsulation of the particular application of the minimal path principle we use below. Another family of relative principles—the relatively locally minimal bad array lemma and so on—could be defined, but since they would be minor combinatorial variants on the principles we have given, we do not do so.

Suppose Λ is an infinite path through the tree of bad partial arrays. Then f^Λ is clearly bad, and we must check that $\mathrm{dom}(f^\Lambda)$ is a barrier. If $b \in B \upharpoonright base(\mathrm{dom}(f^\Lambda))$ then there must be some n such that $b \in base(\mathrm{dom}(f^{\Lambda \upharpoonright n}))$ and $\max b < base(\mathrm{dom}(f^{\Lambda \upharpoonright n}))$, which implies that $b \in \mathrm{dom}(f^{\Lambda \upharpoonright n})$. □

We use the following uniformly effective version of the clopen Ramsey Theorem (the proof of the clopen Ramsey Theorem in $\mathbf{ATR_0}$ is carried out in [6], with another proof given in [1]; the effective bounds for the complexity are given in [5]).

Theorem 7.9 ($\mathbf{ATR_0}$). *For each barrier B, there is an ordinal α such that whenever $B' \subseteq B$ is a barrier and $c : B' \to [0, k]$ is a finite coloring, there is an infinite $S \subseteq base(B)$ such that S is Σ_α in c.*

We may adapt colorings of B to colorings of pairs from B:

Lemma 7.10. *For each barrier B, there is an ordinal α such that whenever $B' \subseteq B$ is a barrier and c is a finite coloring of $\{b, b' \in B' \mid b \triangleleft b'\}$, there is an infinite $S \subseteq base(B)$ such that S is Σ_α in c.*

Proof. Whenever $b, b' \in B$ with $b \triangleleft b'$, write $b \cup b'$ for the unique increasing sequence such $\mathrm{rng}(b \cup b') = \mathrm{rng}(b) \cup \mathrm{rng}(b')$. Define $B^* = \{b \cup b' \mid b, b' \in B \text{ and } b \triangleleft b'\}$. Note that B^* is a barrier on $base(B)$: if Λ is an infinite increasing sequence from $base(B)$, we may find some $b \in B$ such that $b \sqsubset \Lambda$. We may also find some $b' \in B$ such that $b' \sqsubseteq \Lambda^-$. Then we have $b \triangleleft b'$, and therefore $b \cup b' \sqsubseteq \Lambda^-$ and $b \cup b' \in B^*$. Let α be such that given any coloring of a subbarrier of B^*, there is an infinite homogeneous subbarrier Σ_α in c.

Now let $B' \subseteq B$ be given and let c be a finite coloring of $\{b, b' \in B' \mid b \triangleleft b'\}$. We may define a coloring c^* on $(B')^* \subseteq B^*$ by $c^*(b \cup b') = c(b, b')$. Let $S \subseteq base(B')$ be given such that c^* restricted to $(B')^* \upharpoonright S$ is constant. Then c restricted to $B' \upharpoonright S$ is constant. □

Theorem 7.11 ($\mathbf{TLPP_0}$). $\mathbf{GHT}$ *holds.*

Proof. Let B be a barrier, and suppose Q is a B-bqo. We set $(b, \sigma) \prec (b', \sigma')$ if $|\sigma| < |\sigma'|$; clearly $\prec$ is a well-order on $B \times Q^{<\omega}$. Suppose $Q^{<\omega}$ is not a B-bqo; then let Λ be a relatively minimal infinite sequence through the tree of bad partial arrays from B to $Q^{<\omega}$.

Clearly $f^\Lambda(b) \neq \langle\rangle$ for all b, so we may write $f^\Lambda(b) = g(b)^\frown\langle q(b)\rangle$ for all $b \in \mathrm{dom}(f^\Lambda)$. For $b \triangleleft b'$, define $c(b, b') = 0$ iff $q(b) \preceq_Q q(b')$ and $c(b, b') = 1$ otherwise. By the previous lemma, there is an infinite $S \subseteq \mathrm{dom}(f^\Lambda) \subseteq B$ such that c is constant on $B \upharpoonright S$ is either bad or perfect, and since Q is a B-bqo, c must be constantly 0, so $q \upharpoonright (B \upharpoonright S)$ is perfect.

For each n, write $\Lambda(n) = (b_n, q_n)$. Let n be least such that $b_n \in B \upharpoonright S$, and define $B^* = B \upharpoonright (S \cup base(\{b_i\}_{i<n}))$. If $b_i \in B \upharpoonright S$, define $\Lambda'_0(i) = (b_i, g(b_i))$, and if $b_i \in B^* \setminus (B \upharpoonright S)$, define $\Lambda'_0(i) = (b_i, f(b_i))$; if neither of these apply, $\Lambda'_0(i)$ is undefined. Let Λ' be the infinite sequence defined recursively by $\Lambda'(i) = \Lambda'_0(j)$ where j is least such that $\Lambda'_0(j)$ is defined and there is no $i' < i$ with $\Lambda'(i') = \Lambda'_0(j)$.

Observe that for $i < n$, $\Lambda'(i) = \Lambda(i)$ (since by construction, for $i < n$, $b_i \in B^* \setminus (B \upharpoonright S)$), and that $\Lambda'(n) \prec \Lambda(n)$ (since $\Lambda'(n) = (b_n, g(b_n))$ while $\Lambda(n) = (b_n, g(b_n)^\frown\langle q(b_n)\rangle)$).

We now show that Λ' is an infinite path through the tree of bad sequences. Since $\mathrm{dom}(f^{\Lambda'}) = B^*$ is a barrier, we need only show that $f^{\Lambda'}$ is bad. Suppose $\Lambda'(i) = (b, \sigma)$, $\Lambda'(j) = (b', \sigma')$, and $b \triangleleft b'$.

We consider three cases. If $b \in B \upharpoonright S$ and $b' \in B \upharpoonright S$ then $\sigma = g(b)$, $\sigma' = g(b')$. Since $q \upharpoonright (B \upharpoonright S)$ is perfect, $q(b) \preceq_Q q(B')$, and since $g(b)^\frown\langle q(b)\rangle \not\preceq_Q^{<\omega} g(b')^\frown\langle q(b')\rangle$, we must have $g(b) \not\preceq_Q^{<\omega} g(b')$.

If $b \in B^* \setminus (B \upharpoonright S)$ and $b' \in B^* \setminus (B \upharpoonright S)$ then $\sigma = f(b)$, $\sigma' = f(b')$, and we have $f(b) \not\preceq_Q^{<\omega} f(b')$.

Observe that for any $b \in B \upharpoonright S$, $\max(base(B^*) \setminus S) < \max b$. In particular, this means that it is not possible to have $b \in B \upharpoonright S$ but $b' \in B^* \setminus (B \upharpoonright S)$. The remaining case is that $b \in B^* \setminus (B \upharpoonright S)$ while $b' \in B \upharpoonright S$. In this case we have $\sigma = f(b)$ while $\sigma' = g(b')$. Since $g(b') \preceq_Q^{<\omega} f(b')$ and $f(b) \not\preceq_Q^{<\omega} f(b')$, we have $f(b) \not\preceq_Q^{<\omega} g(b')$.

Therefore Λ' is an infinite sequence through the tree of bad partial arrays and $\Lambda' \prec \Lambda$.

It remains to check that the proof just given goes through in $\mathbf{TLPP_0}$. It suffices to show that for each B, there is an α such that Λ' is Σ_α in Λ. Since Λ' is computable from the set S, this follows from the fact that the coloring c is computable from Λ and there is an α such that S is always Σ_α in c. ☐

Corollary 7.12. $\mathbf{NWT}$ *holds in* $\mathbf{TLPP_0}$.

7.2. **Menger's Theorem.** In this subsection, we discuss a theorem about graphs. When G is a graph, we write $V(G)$ for the set of vertices and $E(G)$ for the set of edges.

Definition 7.13. *If G is a graph and $A \subseteq V(G), B \subseteq V(G)$, an A-B* path *is a finite sequences of vertices $v_0, \dots, v_n$ such that $v_0 \in A$, $v_n \in B$, and for each $i < n$, $(v_i, v_{i+1}) \in E(G)$.*

An A-B separator *is a set $C \subseteq V(G)$ such that every A-B path in G contains an element of C.*

Menger's Theorem for countable graphs is:

Theorem 7.14. *For any G and any $A, B \subseteq V(G)$, there is a set M of disjoint A-B paths and an A-B separator C such that C consists of exactly one vertex from each path in M.*

The proof uses the following notions:

Definition 7.15. *A* warp *in (G, A, B) is a subgraph W of G such that:*

- *$A \subseteq V(W)$,*
- *W is a union of disjoint paths beginning in A.*

If W is a warp in (G, A, B), $ter(W)$ is the set of vertices in $V(W)$ which are the terminal elements of paths beginning in A.

A warp W is a wave *if $ter(W)$ is an A-B separator.*

We order waves $W \leq Y$ if W is a subgraph of Y.

It will be convenient to assume that our warps and waves do not contain elements of A except as the first element of a path.

Shafer [12] shows that Menger's Theorem for countable graphs is provable in $\mathbf{\Pi^1_1}$-$\mathbf{CA_0}$, and our treatment of Menger's Theorem follows his paper. His proof is split into two parts:

Lemma 7.16 ($\mathbf{\Pi^1_1}$-$\mathbf{CA_0}$)**.** *For any graph G and sets $A, B \subseteq V(G)$, there is a countably coded ω-model M of $\mathbf{\Sigma^1_1}$-$\mathbf{DC_0}$ containing G, A, B such that M believes there is a maximal (with respect to $\leq$) wave W.*

Lemma 7.17 ($\mathbf{ACA_0}$)**.** *If M is a countably coded ω-model of $\mathbf{\Sigma^1_1}$-$\mathbf{DC_0}$ containing G, A, B and M believes there is a maximal wave W then the conclusion of Menger's Theorem holds for G, A, B.*

It suffices to show that the first lemma can be proven in $\mathbf{TLPP_0}$; by Theorems 4.4 and 4.6, we need only show the following:

Lemma 7.18 ($\mathbf{ACA_0}$)**.** *Let G, A, B be given. There is an ill-founded tree T, a well-ordering $\prec$, and a computable bijection π between waves and paths through T such that whenever $W \leq W'$, $\pi(W') \preceq \pi(W)$.*

Proof. Fix an enumeration $V(G) = \{g_0, g_1, \ldots\}$ and an enumeration $\{p_0, p_1, \ldots\}$ of all A-B paths in G. We define T to consist of sequences $\langle \delta_0, \ldots, \delta_n \rangle$ such that:

- If i is even, either $\delta_{2i} = (0, 0)$ or $\delta_{2i} = (1, q_i)$ where q_i is a path beginning with A and ending with g_i,
- If i is odd, $\delta_{2i+1} = (i + 2, S_i)$ where S_i is a non-empty subset of $V(p_i)$,
- If q_i intersects q_j then either q_i is an end-extension of q_j or q_j is an end-extension of q_i,
- If g_i appears in q_j then $\delta_{2i} \neq (0, 0)$,
- If $g_i \in A$ then $\delta_{2i} \neq (0, 0)$,
- If $g_i \in S_j$ then $\delta_{2i} \neq (0, 0)$,
- There is some $g_i \in S_j$ such that no path q_k is a proper end-extension of q_i.

Given an infinite path Λ, we define a warp $W = \pi^{-1}(\Lambda) = \bigcup_i q_i$. If $g_i \in A$ then q_i witnesses that $g_i \in V(W)$. W is, by definition, a union of paths beginning in A, and the third condition ensures that distinct paths are disjoint. To see that W is a wave, observe that for any A-B path p_i, some element in S_i must be the final element of a path.

Conversely, given a wave W, we define a path $\pi(W)$ through this tree as follows:

- If $g_i \in V(W)$ then $\pi(W)(2i) = (1, q_i)$ where q_i is the (unique) path in W beginning in A and ending with g_i,
- If $g_i \notin V(W)$ then $\pi(W)(2i) = (0, 0)$,
- $\pi(W)(2i + 1) = (2i + 1, V(p_i) \cap V(W))$.

Since W is a wave, $\pi(W)$ is a path through T.

We define $\prec$ by:

- $(1, (g, q)) \prec (0, 0)$,
- $(i + 2, S) \prec (i + 2, S')$ if $S' \subsetneq S$.

To see that this is well-founded, note in $(i + 2, S)$, $|S| \leq |V(p_i)|$ is finite.

We must check that if $W < W'$ then $\pi(W') \prec \pi(W)$. Since $W < W'$, there must be some $g_i \in V(W) \setminus V(W')$; we may assume g_i is the least such. Clearly $\pi(W')(2i) \prec \pi(W)(2i)$, so we need only check that for $j < i$, $\pi(W')(j) \preceq \pi(W)(j)$. For j even, by construction and the fact that i was chosen least, $\pi(W)(j) = \pi(W')(j)$. For j odd, since $V(W') \subseteq V(W)$, we must have $\pi(W)(j) \preceq \pi(W')(j)$ as desired.

To see that T is ill-founded, observe that there is a wave W (specifically, $V(W) = A$ and $E(W) = \emptyset$), and therefore $\pi(W)$ is an infinite path through T. $\square$

Shafer's proof now shows:

Theorem 7.19 ($\mathbf{TLPP_0}$)**.** *Menger's Theorem for countable graphs holds.*

8. THE RELATIVE LEFTMOST PATH PRINCIPLE

In this section we prove:

Theorem 8.1. $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{\alpha+1}(\mathbf{\Pi^1_1})$-$\mathbf{TI_0}$ *proves* $WO(\alpha) \to \mathbf{\Sigma}_\alpha$-$\mathbf{LPP_0}$ *where α is a successor.*

For the remainder of this section, fix α and assume $WO(\alpha)$. We write δ, γ for arbitrary elements of $\mathrm{field}(\alpha)$ and λ for limits in $\mathrm{field}(\alpha)$. We also fix a sequence of trees T and a well-founded ordering $\prec$.

All definitions in this section are assumed to be givin in $\mathbf{ATR_0}$. We will import as many definitions as possible from Section 6, since for successor level our definitions are unchanged.

Definition 8.2. *We define $\mathcal{L}^\alpha$ to be the language $\mathcal{L}$ from above, together with, for each limit $\lambda \in \mathrm{field}(\alpha+1)$, a new predicate V_λ. For each $\gamma \in \mathrm{field}(\alpha+1)$, we define the* rank γ formulas *and the* basic rank γ formulas *inductively by:*

- *$F(i) = j$ where i, j are terms is a basic rank 0 formula,*
- *All other atomic formulas are rank 0 formulas,*
- *If ϕ is a rank γ formula then $\exists x\phi$ and $\forall x\phi$ are basic rank $\gamma+1$ formula,*
- *For any limit $\lambda \in \mathrm{field}(\alpha+1)$ and any n, $V_\lambda(n)$ is a basic rank λ formula,*
- *The rank γ formulas contain the basic rank γ formulas and are closed under $\wedge, \vee, \neg, \rightarrow$.*

We write $\mathcal{F}_\gamma$ for the collection of basic formulas of rank γ, $\mathcal{F}_{<\gamma}$ for $\bigcup_{\delta<\gamma} \mathcal{F}_\delta$, and write $rk(\phi)$ for the least γ such that ϕ is a formula of rank γ.

Fix a Gödel coding $\ulcorner\cdot\urcorner$ of $\mathcal{L}^\alpha$. We define $\vdash$ on $\mathcal{L}^\alpha$ by adding two additional clauses to usual deduction relation for first-order logic:

- *$s \vdash V_\lambda(\ulcorner\phi\urcorner)$ iff $rk(\phi) < \lambda$ and $s \vdash \phi$.*
- *If $rk(\phi) \geq \lambda$ then $s \vdash \neg V_\lambda(\ulcorner\phi\urcorner)$.*

Definition 8.3. *Let α be a well-ordering. For each $\gamma \in \mathrm{field}(\alpha+1)$, define $\mathcal{T}_\gamma(T)$ to be the set of consistent, finite sets s of closed basic formulas of rank $\leq \gamma$ such that:*

- *If $F(i) = k \in s$ and $i' < i$ then there is a j' such that $F(i') = j' \in s$,*
- *Let i be largest such that for some j, the formula $F(i) = j \in s$; then the sequence $\langle F(0), \dots, F(i)\rangle \in T$,*
- *If $\exists x\phi(x) \in s$ then there is some i such that $s \cap \mathcal{F}_{rk(\phi)} \vdash \phi(i)$,*
- *If $V_\lambda(\ulcorner\phi\urcorner) \in s$ then $rk(\phi) < \lambda$ and $s \cap \mathcal{F}_{<rk(\phi)} \vdash \phi$.*

If $s \in \mathcal{F}_\lambda$, we write $rk(s) = \max\{rk(\phi) \mid \phi \in s \cap \mathcal{F}_{<\lambda}\}$.

We say s decides $V_\lambda(\ulcorner\phi\urcorner)$ if $V_\lambda(\ulcorner\phi\urcorner) \in s$, $V_\lambda(\ulcorner\neg\phi\urcorner) \in s$, or $rk(\phi) \geq \lambda$.

If $\delta \leq \gamma$, define $\pi^\gamma_\delta : \mathcal{T}_\gamma(T) \to \mathcal{T}_\delta(T)$ by $\pi^\gamma_\delta(s) = \{\phi \in s \mid rk(\phi) \leq \delta\}$.

If $\delta < \lambda$, $t \in \mathcal{T}_\delta(T)$, $s \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda(T)$, we write $t \prec^{+1} s$ if there is a formula $V_\lambda(\ulcorner\phi\urcorner) \in s$ such that $t \vdash \neg\phi$.

Definition 8.4. *We extend the definition of $WF'_\gamma \subseteq \mathcal{T}_\gamma(T)$ by adding a definition for limits:*

- *$WF'_\lambda(t)$ holds if $WF'_{rk(t)}(\pi^\lambda_{rk(t)})$.*

Note that, as above, each WF_λ is a $\Sigma_\lambda(\Pi^1_1)$ formula.

Lemma 8.5 ($\mathbf{ATR_0}$). *If $WF_\gamma(s)$ and $s \subseteq t$ then $WF_\gamma(t)$.*

Lemma 8.6 ($\mathbf{\Sigma_{\alpha+1}(\Pi^1_1)}$-$\mathbf{TI_0}$). *Let $\delta \leq \gamma \leq \alpha$. Then:*

1. *If $WF_\delta(\pi^\gamma_\delta(s))$ then $WF_\gamma(s)$, and*
2. *If $t \in \mathcal{T}_\gamma(T) \cap \mathcal{T}_\delta(T)$ and $WF_\gamma(t)$ then $WF_\delta(t)$.*

Proof. We prove these by simultaneous induction on γ, δ. (Note that the statements of these two parts are of the form $\forall x(\phi(x) \rightarrow \psi(x))$ where ϕ, ψ are $\Sigma_\gamma(\Pi^1_1)$ or $\Sigma_\delta(\Pi^1_1)$ with $\delta \leq \gamma < \alpha$, so the statement of the theorem is $\Sigma_{\gamma+1}(\Pi^1_1)$, and so at worst $\Sigma_{\alpha+1}(\Pi^1_1)$.) Suppose the claim holds for all pairs $\delta' \leq \gamma'$ with either $\delta' < \delta$ or $\gamma' < \gamma$.

If $\gamma = \delta$, this is immediate. Suppose $\delta < \gamma$ and $\gamma = \beta + 1$. If $WF_\delta(\pi^{\beta+1}_\delta(s))$ then by IH, $WF_\beta(\pi^{\beta+1}_\beta(s))$, and therefore by Lemma 6.7, $WF_{\beta+1}(s)$.

If $t \in \mathcal{T}_{\beta+1}(T) \cap \mathcal{T}_\delta(T) = \mathcal{T}_\delta(T)$ and $WF_{\beta+1}(t)$ then t contains no formula of rank $\beta + 1$, and so there are no $s \supseteq \pi^{\beta+1}_\beta(t) = t$ such that $s \prec^{+1} t$, so we must have $WF_\beta(t)$, and therefore by IH, $WF_\delta(t)$.

Suppose $\gamma = \lambda$ is a limit ordinal. If $WF_\delta(\pi^\lambda_\delta(s))$, we consider two cases. If $rk(s) \geq \delta$ then we have $WF_{rk(s)}(\pi^\lambda_{rk(s)}(s))$ by applying the first part of IH to $\delta, rk(s)$, and therefore $WF_\lambda(s)$. If $rk(s) < \delta$ then we have $\pi^\lambda_\delta(s) = \pi^\lambda_{rk(s)}(s)$, so by applying the second part of IH to $rk(s), \delta$, we have $WF_{rk(s)}(s)$.

Suppose $t \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda(T) \cap \mathcal{T}_\delta(T)$ and $WF_\lambda(t)$. Then since $rk(t) \leq \delta$, we may apply the first part of IH to $rk(t), \delta$ to obtain $WF_\delta(t)$. ☐

Lemma 8.7 ($\mathbf{\Sigma}_{\alpha+1}(\mathbf{\Pi^1_1})$-$\mathbf{TI_0}$). *Let $\delta \leq \gamma \leq \alpha$, let ϕ be a basic rank δ formula, let $s \in \mathcal{T}_\gamma(T)$, and suppose that for every $t \supseteq s$ such that t decides ϕ, $WF_\gamma(t)$. Then $WF_\gamma(s)$.*

Proof. By main induction on δ and side induction on γ. (Note that for a given γ the statement is $\Sigma_{\gamma+1}(\Pi^1_1)$, so the statement is $\Sigma_{\alpha+1}(\Pi^1_1)$.)The case where $\delta = \gamma = 0$ is handled by Lemma 6.8. The case where $\delta = \gamma$ and γ is a successor is handled by Lemma 6.9. The case where $\delta < \gamma$ and γ is a successor is handled by Lemma 6.10.

So suppose γ is a limit ordinal. It suffices to show that if for every $t \supseteq s$ such that t decides ϕ, $WF_\gamma(t)$, then $WF'_\gamma(s)$. If $\delta = \gamma$ then $\phi = V_\gamma(\ulcorner\psi'\urcorner)$; in this case, we set $\psi = \exists x \psi'$ for some variable x not appearing in ψ; otherwise $\delta < \gamma$ and we set $\psi = \psi'$. Set $\beta = \max\{rk(s), rk(\psi)\} < \gamma$.

Suppose $t \supseteq \pi^\gamma_\beta(s)$ and t decides ψ. Set

$$t' = \begin{cases} t \cup s & \text{if } \delta < \gamma \\ t \cup s \cup \{V(\ulcorner\psi'\urcorner)\} & \text{if } \delta = \gamma \text{ and } t \vdash \psi \\ t \cup s \cup \{V(\ulcorner\neg\psi'\urcorner)\} & \text{if } \delta = \gamma \text{ and } t \vdash \neg\psi \end{cases}$$

Then for any ρ, $t' \vdash \rho$ iff $t \vdash \rho$, so t' is consistent. Also, $t' \supseteq s$ and t' decides ϕ, so $WF_\gamma(t')$. Since $rk(t') = \beta$ and $\pi^\gamma_\beta(t') = t$, we have $WF_\beta(t)$. Since $WF_\beta(t)$ holds for all $t \supseteq \pi^\gamma_\beta(s)$ deciding ψ, it follows from IH that $WF_\beta(\pi^\gamma_\beta(s))$ holds. Therefore $WF_\gamma(s)$ holds. ☐

Lemma 8.8 ($\mathbf{\Sigma}_\alpha(\mathbf{\Pi^1_1})$-$\mathbf{TI_0}$). *If $WF_\gamma(\emptyset)$ then $WF_0(\emptyset)$.*

Proof. By induction on γ. If γ is a successor, this follows immediately from IH and Lemma 6.11. If γ is a limit then since $rk(\emptyset) = 0$, we immediately have $WF_\gamma(\emptyset)$. ☐

The definition of $\widehat{\mathcal{T}_{\gamma+1}}$ given above for γ a successor is unchanged. In particular, we obtain:

Theorem 8.9 ($\mathbf{\Sigma}_{\alpha+1}(\mathbf{\Pi^1_1})$-$\mathbf{TI_0}$). *Assume α is a successor. Suppose there is no infinite path through $\widehat{\mathcal{T}_\alpha(T)}^+$ deciding all decisions of rank $\leq \alpha$. Then T is well-founded.*

Proof. We apply Theorem 6.19. The first two assumptions are given by Lemmas 8.8 and 8.7. Note that Lemma 6.17 is identical for $\Sigma_{\alpha+1}(\Pi^1_1)$ formulas. ☐

Definition 8.10. *Let ϕ be a closed formula of $\mathcal{L}^\alpha$. Then $\hat{\phi}(X, Y)$ is the formula of second-order arithmetic which interprets the function symbol F by X, the predicate symbol $\overline{T}$ by Y, and $V_\lambda(\ulcorner\phi\urcorner)$ by $\forall Y\ (H_\theta(\lambda, Y) \rightarrow (\ulcorner\phi\urcorner, rk(\phi)) \in Y)$ for a suitable formula θ.*

Lemma 8.11 ($\mathbf{ATR_0}$)**.** *Let Λ be a path through $\mathcal{T}_\alpha(T)$ deciding all formulas of rank $\leq \alpha$ and let σ_Λ be the corresponding sequence through T given by $\sigma_\Lambda(i) = j$ iff $F(i) = j \in \Lambda(m)$ for some (and therefore cofinitely many) m.*

Then whenever ϕ is a closed formula of rank $\leq \alpha$, the following are equivalent:

1. *There is an m such that $\phi \in \Lambda(m)$,*
2. *$\hat{\phi}(\sigma_\Lambda, T)$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on formulas. The only new case is when $\phi = V(\ulcorner\psi\urcorner)$; this is easily covered by the inductive hypothesis. □

Then the proof of the following is unchanged:

Theorem 8.12 ($\mathbf{\Sigma_{\alpha+1}(\Pi^1_1)}$**-**$\mathbf{TI_0}$)**.** *If α is a successor,* $\mathbf{\Sigma_\alpha}$-$\mathbf{MPP_0}$.

REFERENCES

[1] Jeremy Avigad. An effective proof that open sets are Ramsey. *Arch. Math. Logic*, 37(4):235–240, 1998.

[2] Jeremy Avigad and Solomon Feferman. Gödel's functional ("Dialectica") interpretation. In *Handbook of proof theory*, volume 137 of *Stud. Logic Found. Math.*, pages 337–405. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1998.

[3] Jeremy Avigad and Henry Towsner. Functional interpretation and inductive definitions. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 74(4):1100–1120, 2009.

[4] Peter A. Cholak, Carl G. Jockusch, and Theodore A. Slaman. On the strength of Ramsey's theorem for pairs. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 66(1):1–55, 2001.

[5] Peter Clote. A recursion theoretic analysis of the clopen Ramsey theory. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 49(2):376–400, 1984.

[6] Harvey M. Friedman, Kenneth McAloon, and Stephen G. Simpson. A finite combinatorial principle which is equivalent to the 1-consistency of predicative analysis. In *Patras Logic Symposion (Patras, 1980)*, volume 109 of *Stud. Logic Foundations Math.*, pages 197–230. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1982.

[7] U. Kohlenbach. *Applied proof theory: proof interpretations and their use in mathematics*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2008.

[8] Alberto Marcone. On the logical strength of Nash-Williams' theorem on transfinite sequences. In *Logic: from foundations to applications (Staffordshire, 1993)*, Oxford Sci. Publ., pages 327–351. Oxford Univ. Press, New York, 1996.

[9] C. St. J. A. Nash-Williams. On well-quasi-ordering finite trees. *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 59:833–835, 1963.

[10] Michael Rathjen and Andreas Weiermann. Proof-theoretic investigations on Kruskal's theorem. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 60(1):49–88, 1993.

[11] Kurt Schütte and Stephen G. Simpson. Ein in der reinen Zahlentheorie unbeweisbarer Satz über endliche Folgen von natürlichen Zahlen. *Arch. Math. Logik Grundlag.*, 25(1-2):75–89, 1985.

[12] Paul Shafer. Menger's Theorem in Π^1_1-CA_0. April 2011.

[13] Stephen G. Simpson. Ordinal numbers and the Hilbert basis theorem. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 53(3):961–974, 1988.

[14] Stephen G. Simpson. *Subsystems of second order arithmetic*. Perspectives in Mathematical Logic. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, 520 PORTOLA PLAZA, BOX 951555, LOS ANGELES, CA 90095-1555, USA

E-mail address: `htp@math.ucla.edu`

URL: `www.math.ucla.edu/~hpt`